



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 49]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, विसम्बर 2, 1972/अग्राहायणा 11, 1894

No. 49]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1972/AGRAHAYANA 11, 1894

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गये विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administration of Union Territories)

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

New Delhi, 21st October, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 3947.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Vishnuvardhan Reddy, 3-4-75, Lingampally, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, a contesting candidate for General Election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 206. Gagan Mahal constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Vishnuvardhan Reddy to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or

of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

By order,
[No. AP-IA/206/72.]

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

नई दिल्ली, 21 अक्टूबर, 1972

आदेश

का.आ. 3947.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 206-गगन महल निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री विष्णुवर्धन रेड्डी, 3-4-75 लिंगामपल्ली, हैदराबाद, आन्ध्र प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

अतः, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टी-

करण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित्य नहीं है।

अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री विष्णु वर्धन रेड्डी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

आदेश से,
[सं. आ. प्र.नि.स./208/72.]

ORDER

S.O. 3948.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sarvadevabhatla Narasimha Murthy (Kaviraja Murthy) resident of Pentagadda Bazar, Khammam, a contesting candidate for general election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 274. Khammam constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sarvadevabhatla Narasimha Murthy (Kaviraja Murthy) to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

By order,
[No. AP-LA/274/72.]

आदेश

का.आ. 3948.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 274-खम्मम निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सर्वदेवा भट्टला नरीसम्हामूर्ति (कविराज मूर्ति) निवासी पन्तागाड्डा बाजार खम्मम लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित्य नहीं है।

अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री सर्वदेवा भट्टला नरसिम्हा मूर्ति (कविराज मूर्ति) को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

आदेश से,
[सं. आ. प्र.नि.स./274/72.]

The 23rd October, 1972.

ORDER

S.O. 3949.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Yarlagadda Ravi Prasad, Nandivada (Via) Janardhanapuram, Gudivada taluk, Andhra Pradesh, a contesting candidate for general election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 86-Mudinepalli constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as re-

quired by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Yarlagadda Ravi Prasad to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

By Order,

[No. AP-LA/86/72]

दिनांक, 23 अक्टूबर, 1972

आदेश

का.आ. 3949.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 86 मुद्दिनापल्ली निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री यारलागाडा रवि प्रसाद नन्दीवाडा (वाया) जनार्धनापुरम, गोदीवाडा तालुक, आन्ध्र प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री यारला गाडा रवि प्रसाद का संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

आदेश से,
[सं. आ. प्र.नि.स./86/72.]

ORDER

S.O. 3950.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sojlingam, 12-8-2/6/3, Allugudabai, Mettuguda P.O. Lallaguda, Secunderabad, a contesting candidate for general election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 215. Secunderabad Cantonment (SC) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after the notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure.

Now therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sojlingam to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

By Order,

[No. AP-LA/215/72]

आदेश

का.आ. 3950.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 215 सिकन्दराबाद कॅंटांनमेंट (अ. जा.) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सांजीलिंगम 12-8-276/3, अल्लुगुड्डाबाई, मंडगूडा, (डाकघर लल्लुगुड्डा, सिकन्दराबाद) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे ; या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री सांजीलिंगम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

आदेश से,

[सं. आ. प्र.-वि. स./215/72.]

ORDER

S.O. 3951.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Gunteti Narasiah, Kokkireni Village and Post Office, Khammam Taluk, a contesting candidate for general election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 273, Palair (SC) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Gunteti Narasiah to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

By Order,

[No. AP-LA/273/72]

आदेश

का.आ. 3951.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 273 पालौर (अ. जा.) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री गुंटेट्टी नरसियाह, गांव व डाकघर कोक्किरेनी, खम्माम तालुक लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री गुंटेट्टी नरसियाह को संसद के

किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान-परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

आदेश से,

[सं. आ. प्र.-वि. स./273/72.]

The 27th October, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 3952.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Krishna Reddy, Pebbair Post, Wanaparthy Taluk, Mahbubnagar District, a contesting candidate for general election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 194, Alampur constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Krishna Reddy to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

By order,

[No. AP-LA/194/72]

दिनांक, 27 अक्टूबर, 1972

का.आ. 3952.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 194 आलमपुर निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कृष्णा रेड्डी डाकघर पेबैर तालुक, जिला महबूब नगर लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क का अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कृष्णा रेड्डी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

आदेश से,

[सं. आ. प्र.-वि. स./194/72.]

The 13th November, 1972

S.O. 3953.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act 1950, the Election Commission, in consultation with the Administration of the Union Territory of Laccadives, hereby nominates Shri T.T. Joseph, Collector-cum-Development Commissioner of the Union Territory, as the Chief Electoral Officer for the Union Territory also, from the date he takes over charge vice Shri K. Damodara Menon.

By Order,

[No. 154/LMA/72.]

दिनांक, 13 नवम्बर, 1972

का.आ. 3953.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 की धारा 13 क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्वाचन आयोग लक्कादीव संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के प्रशासन के परामर्श से श्री के. वामोदर मैनन के स्थान पर श्री टी. टी. जोसफ. संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के कलक्टर एवं विकास आयुक्त को संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के लिए मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में भी उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से एतद्वारा नामनिर्देशित करता है।

आदेश से,
[सं. 154/लक्कादीव/72.]

The 21st November, 1972

S.O. 3954.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 13A of the Representation of the people Act, 1950, the Election Commission of India, in consultation with the Government of Mysore, hereby nominates Shri D. Balagopalan, an Officer of the Indian Administrative Service borne on the cadre of Mysore State as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Mysore with effect from the 15th November, 1972, and until further orders vice Shri M. Syed Murshed Peer.

By Order,
[No. 154/My/72]

दिनांक, 21 नवम्बर, 1972

का.आ. 3954.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 की धारा 13 क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्वाचन आयोग मैसूर राज्य सरकार के परामर्श से श्री एम. सैयद मुशीद पीर के स्थान पर श्री डी. बालगोपालन, मैसूर राज्य की सूची पर भारतीय प्रशासनिक सेवा के अधिकारी, को मैसूर

राज्य के लिए मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में 15 नवम्बर, 1972 से अगले आदेशों तक एतद्वारा नामनिर्देशित करता है।

आदेश से,
[सं. 154/महा./72.]

S.O. 3955.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, the Election Commission, in consultation with the Government of Maharashtra, hereby nominates Shri G. H. Lalvani, Secretary to Government, General Administration Department, and Director of Resettlement for Project Affected Persons, as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Maharashtra from the date he takes over and until further orders vice Shri L. M. Nadkarni.

[No. 154/MT/72.]

By order,
B. N. BHARDWAJ, Secy.

का.आ. 3955.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 की धारा 13 क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्वाचन आयोग महाराष्ट्र सरकार के परामर्श से, श्री एल. एम. नड्कारनी के स्थान पर सामान्य प्रशासन विभाग के सचिव तथा परियोजना से प्रभावित व्यक्तियों के पुनर्वास के लिए निदेशक श्री जी. एच. ललवानी, को महाराष्ट्र राज्य के लिए मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से अगले आदेशों तक एतद्वारा नाम निर्देशित करता है।

आदेश से,
[सं. 154 महा./72.]
बी. एन. भारद्वाज, सचिव।

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Revenue & Insurance)

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1972

S. O. 3956.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 read with rule 34 of the Central Civil Services (Classification Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, the President hereby makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue & Insurance) No. S.R.O. No. 612, dated the 28th February, 1957, namely :—

In the Schedule to the said notification;

(a) in Part II, General Central Service, Class III, for the existing entries under the heading "Emergency Risks Insurance Scheme", the following entries shall be substituted, namely :—

Description of Post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties and penalties which it may impose (with reference to item numbers in rule 11)		Appellate Authority
		Authority	Penalties	
1	2	3	4	5
"All Posts	Deputy Director	Deputy Director Assistant Director	All (i) to (iv)	Deputy Secretary. Deputy Director."

(b) in Part III, General Central Service, Class IV, for the existing entries under the heading "Emergency Risks Insurance Scheme", the following entries shall be substituted, namely :—

1	2	3	4	5
"All Posts	Assistant Director	Assistant Director. Chief Enforcement Officer.	All (i) to (iv)	Deputy Director Assistant Director."

[S. R. O. 21/F. No.32/17/72-Ad.IA]

S. R. SHARMA, Under Secretary.

वित्त मंत्रालय
(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक 15 नवम्बर, 1972

का० आ० 3956.—केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियमावली, 1965 के नियम 34 के साथ पठित नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2), नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के खंड (ख) और नियम 24 के उप-नियम (1) के अनुसरण में राष्ट्रपति एतद्वारा भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व और बीमा विभाग) की दिनांक 28 फरवरी, 1957 की अधिसूचना, मार्गिक नियम आदेश सं० 612, में निम्नलिखित अतिरिक्त संशोधन करते हैं :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में—

(क) खंड II, विविध केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी II में "आपात जोखिम बीमा योजना" शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत वर्तमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां प्रतिस्थापित की जाएंगी ; अर्थात् :—

पद का विवरण	नियोजक अधिकारी	दंड लगाने के लिए सक्षम अधिकारी और दंड जो वह लगा सकता है (नियम 11 में निहित मद मर्यादों के संदर्भ में)	अपीलीय प्राधिकारी
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
"सभी पद"	उप निदेशक	उप निदेशक सहायक निदेशक	सभी (i) से (iv) तक

(ख) खंड iii, विविध केन्द्रीय सेवा श्रेणी iv में "आपात जोखिम बीमा योजना" शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत वर्तमान प्रविष्टियों की जगह निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां प्रतिस्थापित की जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
"सभी पद"	सहायक निदेशक	सहायक निदेशक मुख्य प्रवर्तन अधिकारी	सभी (i) से (iv) तक	उप निदेशक सहायक निदेशक

[मार्गिक नियम आदेश 21/का० सं० 32/17/72-प्रशा०-1ए०]

एस० आर० शर्मा अवर सचिव

New Delhi the, 25th November, 1972

CUSTOMS

S.O. 3957.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of section 7, read with sub-section (3) of section 160, of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment to the notification of the Government of India in the late Central Board of Revenue No. 44-Customs, dated the 7th May, 1960, namely:—

In the list of ports specified in the said notification, the port "Koithottam" shall be omitted.

[No. 126 F. No. 14/5/70-LCH.]

K. SANKARARAMAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक 25 नवम्बर, 1972

(सीमा शुल्क)

का० आ० 3957.—सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की, धारा 160 की उपधारा (3) के साथ पठित, धारा 7 के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रवर्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व केन्द्रीय राजस्व बोर्ड की अधिसूचना सं० 44-सीमा-शुल्क, तारीख 7 मई, 1960 में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में विनिर्दिष्ट पत्तनों की सूची में से "कोयलथोट्टम" पत्तन निकाल दिया जाएगा।

[सं० 126 फा० सं० 4/5070 एव० सी० II]

के० शंकरारामन, अवर सचिव।

(Banking Department)

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 16th November 1972

S.O. 3958—An Account pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934, for the week ended the 10th day of November, 1972

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Notes held in the Banking Department	43,10,09,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation	4768,22,16,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,11,000	
Total Notes issued		4811,32,25,000	(b) Held outside India	
			Foreign Securities	196,65,38,000	
			TOTAL		379,18,49,000
			Rupee Coin		22,83,72,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		4409,30,04,000
			International Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper
Total Liabilities		4811,32,25,000	Total Assets		4811,32,25,000

Dated the 15th day of November 1972

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor.

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 10th November, 1972

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	43,10,09,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	3,96,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	209,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,01,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	45,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	175,00,00,000	(a) Internal	1,17,58,000
		(b) External
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	344,20,00,000
		Balances Held Abroad*	144,32,04,000
Deposits :—		Investments**	400,84,16,000
(a) Government		Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) Central Government	111,77,23,000	(i) Central Government
(ii) State Governments	8,89,91,000	(ii) State Governments@	45,69,99,000
(b) Banks		Loans Advances to :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	265,50,37,000	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	5,90,50,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	10,94,07,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	226,77,69,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,07,46,000	(iii) Others	3,23,22,000
(iv) Other Banks	36,35,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(c) Others	95,16,19,000	(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
Bills Payable	70,01,10,000	(i) State Governments	53,59,16,000
Other Liabilities	331,38,22,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks	20,87,05,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks
		(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	10,00,000,000
	1479,10,90,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	10,87,75,000
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	28,97,24,000
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	93,06,94,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank
		Other Assets	46,40,52,000
			1479,10,90,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Shorts-Term Securities.

**Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. Nil advanced to Scheduled Commercial Banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 15th day of November 1972.

S. J. Governor
[No. F. 1/3/72-BOI]

बैंकिंग विभाग
रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
नई दिल्ली 17 नवम्बर

का० प्रा० 3958—रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में नवम्बर 1972 को 10 तारीख को समाप्त हुए मप्ताह के लिए लेखा

पशु विभाग

तदेयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	भारतियां	रुपये	रुपये
1	2	3	4	5	6
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	43,10,09,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुनियात :—		
संचलन में नोट	4768,22,16,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,11,000	
			(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
जारी किये गये कुल नोट		4811,32,25,000	विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	196,65,38,000	
			जोड़		379,18,49,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		22,83,72,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति-		
			भूतियां		4409,30,04,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे		
			वाणिज्य पत्र		..
कुल देयताएं		4811,32,25,000	कुल भारितियां		4811,32,25,000

तारीख 15 नवम्बर, 1972

एस० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर

10 नवम्बर, 1972 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यालय का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	भारितियां	रुपये
1	2	3	4
चुक्ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	43,10,09,000
आरक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	3,96,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण	209,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	3,01,000
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि		खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		(क) देशी	1,17,58,000
(स्थिरीकरण) निधि	45,00,00,000	(ख) विदेशी	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	344,20,00,000
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि	175,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ ऋण*	144,32,04,000
जमा राशियां :—		निवेश**	400,84,16,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	111,77,23,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	8,89,91,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	45,69,99,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अग्रिम	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	265,50,37,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को	5,90,50,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	10,94,07,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	226,77,69,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,07,46,000	(iii) दूसरों को	3,23,22,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक	36,35,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम	
		और निवेश :—	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	53,59,16,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	20,87,05,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों को	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	10,00,00,000

वेयताएँ	रुपये	आस्तियाँ	रुपये
1	2	3	4
(ग) अन्य	95,16,19,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम	10,87,75,000
वेय बिल	70,01,10,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि से	28,97,24,000
अन्य वेयताएँ	331,38,22,000	ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश (क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	93,06,94,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किए गए बाटों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश	..
		अन्य अस्तियाँ	46,40,52,000
	रुपये 1479,10,90,000		रुपये 1479,10,90,000

*नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियाँ शामिल हैं।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी भोचर-प्लान शामिल हैं।

†रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17(4)(ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को सीमादी [बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये] शून्य रुपये शामिल हैं।

††राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

एस० जगन्नाथन गवर्नर,

[सं० फ० 1/3/72-बी०आ० 1]

The 24th November 1972

S. O. 3959—An Account pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934, for the week ended the 17th day of November 1972

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	36,50,31,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :		
Notes in circulation	4749,19,72,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,11,000	
Total Notes issued		4785,70,03,000	(b) Held outside India	..	
			Foreign Securities	191,65,38,000	
			Total		374,18,49,000
			Rupee Coin		22,20,50,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		4389,31,04,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
Total Liabilities		4785,70,03,000	Total Assets		4785,70,03,000

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor

Dated, the 22nd day of November 1972

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department
as on the 17th November, 1972

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	36,50,31,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	3,59,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	209,00,00,000	Small Coin	2,95,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	45,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	175,00,00,000	(a) Internal	1,13,53,000
		(b) External
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	339,62,78,000
		Balances Held Abroad*	151,06,72,000
		Investments**	388,21,70,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Central Government
		(ii) State Governments ^(a)	35,13,00,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
Deposits :—		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	4,28,50,000
(a) Government		(ii) State Co-operative Banks‡	226,93,17,000
(i) Central Government	52,31,11,000	(iii) Others	5,12,97,000
(ii) State Governments	13,81,74,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(b) Banks		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	283,51,73,000	(i) State Governments	53,59,15,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	10,52,63,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks	20,93,58,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,07,52,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks
(iv) Other Banks	27,23,000	(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	10,00,00,000
(c) Others	88,89,45,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	10,87,75,000
Bills Payable	72,24,15,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
Other Liabilities	340,07,14,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	28,98,84,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	93,06,94,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank
		Other Assets	41,17,22,000
Rupees	1446,72,70,000	Rupees	1446,72,70,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

^(a) Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

†Includes Rs. Nil advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

**Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated, the 22nd November, 1972

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor

[No. F. 1/3/72-BOI]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1972

का० प्रा० 3959—रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसूचन में नवम्बर 1972 की 17 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा दृष्टि विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	आस्थियां	रुपये	रुपये
सोने का भिक्का और बुलियन :—					
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	36,50,31,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,11,000	
संचलन में नोट	4749,19,72,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ	..	
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	191,65,38,000	
जारी किए गये कुल नोट	4785,70,03,000				
			जोड़	374,18,49,000	
			रुपये का भिक्का	22,20,50,000	
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति-		
			भूतियां	4388,31,04,000	
			देशी विनियम बिल और दूसरे		
			वाणिज्य - पत्र	..	
कुल देयताएं	4785,70,03,000		कुल आस्थियां	4785,70,03,000	

तारीख : 22 नवम्बर 1972

एस० जगन्नाथन गवर्नर

19 नवम्बर 1972 को रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्थियां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	36,50,31,000
आरक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का भिक्का	3,59,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		छोटा भिक्का	2,95,000
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	209,00,00,000	अरीबे और भुनाएं गए बिल	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		(क) देशी	1,13,53,000
(स्विचरीकरण) निधि	45,00,00,000	(ख) विदेशी	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	339,62,78,000
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	175,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ ऋण*	151,06,72,000
अमाराशियां —		निवेश**	388,21,70,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अधिम :—	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	52,31,11,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	13,81,74,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	35,13,00,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अधिम	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	283,51,73,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को*	4,28,50,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	10,52,63,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	226,93,17,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,07,52,000	(iii) दूसरों को	5,12,97,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से	
		ऋण, अधिम और निवेश	
(4) अन्य बैंक	27,23,000	(क) ऋण और अधिम :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	53,59,15,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	20,93,58,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	10,00,00,000
(ग) अन्य	88,89,45,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश	10,87,75,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्विचरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अधिम	

वेधताएं	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
देय बिल	72,24,15,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	28,98,84,000
अन्य वेधताएं	340,07,14,000	राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से	
		ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	93,06,94,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बाह्य/द्विबैंचरी में निवेश	..
		अन्य आस्तियां	41,17,22,000
रुपये	1446,72,70,000	रुपये	1446,72,70,000

*नवादी, आवाधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभृतियां शामिल हैं।

राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किए गये निवेश शामिल नहीं है।

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

†रिजर्व बैंक आफ इण्डिया अधिनियम की धारा 17 (4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित प्राणज्य बैंकों को सीमादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये शून्य रूपये शामिल हैं।

‡राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्मिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख : 22 नवम्बर 1972

एस. जगन्नाथन गवर्नर

[सं फ० 1/3/72-बी० प्रो० I]

च० ब० मीर खन्दानी, अवर सचिव,

New Delhi, the 18th November, 1972

S.O. 3960.—In exercise of the powers conferred upon it by clause (c) of Section 10 of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation Act, 1963 (10 of 1963), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri T.P.Singh, Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, as a Director of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation vice Shri T. P. Singh, retired.

[No. 14/9/71-ACI.]

A. K. DUTT, Joint Secy.

नयी दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 1972

का० प्रा० 3960.—कृषिक पुनर्वित्त निगम अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का दसवां) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (ग) के द्वारा प्राप्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री टी० पी० सिंह के सेवा निवृत्त होने पर, कृषि मंत्रालय, कृषि विभाग के सचिव श्री टी० पी० सिंह को एतद्वारा कृषिक पुनर्वित्त निगम का निदेशक नामित करती है।

[सं० 14/9/71-कृषि-ऋण-एफ]

अमल कुमार दत्त, संयुक्त सचिव।

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 31st October, 1972

S.O. 3961.—WHEREAS by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals, (Department of Petroleum) S.O.No.1871 dated 22.4.72 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

AND WHEREAS the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

AND FURTHER WHEREAS the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

NOW THEREFORE in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipelines;

AND FURTHER in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

[No. 11/2/72-L & L.]

GAS PIPE LINE FROM C.T.F. KALOL TO I.E.F. Co' STATE—Gujarat, DISTRICT—Mehsana, TALUKA—Kalol

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	P. are
Saij	959	0	22	40
„	958	0	02	40
Dhanaj	15	0	01	92
„	16	0	02	90
„	225	0	08	80
„	14	0	70	80
„	224	0	22	40

पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन और खान तथा धातु मंत्रालय
(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 31 अक्टूबर 1972

का० प्रा० 3961—यस: पेट्रोलियम, पाइप लाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन और खान तथा धातु मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० प्रा० सं० 1871 तारीख 22-4-71 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में धिनदिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार की पाइप लाइनों को विधत्ने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करते के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों ने उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, यतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइप लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में विहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, ने सभी बंधकों से मुक्त रूप में, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

(सं० 11/2/72 सेक्टर एण्ड लेजिस०)

सी टी एफ कलोल से आई एफ एफ कं० तक गैस पाइपलाइन

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—महसना	तालुका—कलोल	गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	पी०ए० ग्रा० ई	
			सेज	959	0	22	40
				958	0	02	40
			बानज	15	0	01	92
				16	0	02	90
				225	0	08	80
				14	0	70	80
				224	0	22	40

S.O. 3962.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D. S. Kalol 144 to GGS. VII in Gujarat State Pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE FOR LAYING PIPELINES FROM D. S. No. KALOL 144 TO

G. G. S VII (For the wells 145, 148 & 144

STATE—Gujarat DIST—Gandhinagar TAL—Gandhinagar

Village	S.No.	Hectare	Are.	P.Are.
UVARSAD	926	0	04	91
"	933	0	12	59
"	927	0	26	36
"	928	0	13	37
"	917/5/6	0	10	95
"	Cart Track	0	01	44
"	963/1/1	0	11	33
"	963	0	02	76
"	966/2	0	03	81
"	Cart Track	0	00	77
"	964/2	0	00	50
"	965	0	26	23
"	960/1	0	01	67
"	981/2/13	0	13	46
"	981/1	0	02	40
"	994	0	05	69
"	985/3/2/2	0	07	27
"	985/3/2/1	0	05	13
"	993/4/2	0	13	48
"	990	0	13	41
"	991	0	13	86
"	Cart Track	0	01	21
"	1087	0	06	29
"	1086	0	05	50
"	1085/1	0	06	08
"	1084/1	0	03	20
"	1084/2	0	09	41
"	1081/3	0	08	08
"	1082	0	18	68
"	1076	0	01	90
"	V.P. Road	0	01	00
"	1100	0	01	08
"	1105	0	05	70
"	1104	0	02	40
"	1107	0	03	72

का० आ० 3962 यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में सी एस कलोल 144 से जी जी एस 7 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आप्य एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवन्त कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप समक्ष प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड बरोदा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी निधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

[संख्या 11/2/72 एण्ड एण्ड एण्ड]

अनुसूची

डी एस संख्या कलोल 144 से जी जी एस VII तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए (145, 148, एवं 144 कुओं के लिए)

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—गांधीनगर	तालुका—गांधीनगर		
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	ए आर ई	पी ए आर ई
उवरसद	926	0	04	91
	933	0	12	59
	927	0	25	36
	928	0	13	37
	917/5/6	0	10	95
कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	44	
963/1/1	0	11	35	
963	0	02	76	
966/2'	0	03	81	
कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	77	
964/2	0	00	50	
965	0	26	23	
980/1	0	01	67	
981/2/13	0	13	46	
981/1	0	02	40	
994	0	05	69	
985/3/2/2	0	07	27	
985/3/2/1	0	05	13	
993/4/2	0	13	48	
990	0	13	41	
991	0	13	86	
कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	21	
1087	0	06	29	
1086	0	05	20	
1085/1	0	06	08	
1084/1	0	03	20	
1084/2	0	09	41	
1081/3	0	08	08	
1082	0	18	68	
1076	0	01	90	
बी पी रोड	0	01	00	
1100	0	01	08	
1105	0	05	70	
1104	0	02	40	
1107	0	03	72	

S.O. 3963.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D. S. Kalol 145 to G.G.S. VII in Gujarat State, Pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

[No. 11/2/72-L&L]

SCHEDULE
FOR LAYING FROM D.S.NO.KALOL 145 TO G.G.S. VII
(VIA WELL K-144)
STATE—Gujarat DIST—Gandhinagar TAL—Gandhinagar

Village	S.No.	Hectare	Are	P.Are
TARAPUR	156	0	7	76
"	155/3	0	10	80
"	155/2	0	12	17
"	155/1	0	15	50
"	154/1	0	03	66
UVARASAD	857/P			
"	B58/1	0	15	01
"	Cart Track	0	01	77
"	938/3	0	01	00
"	935/3	0	08	30
"	D.L.B.Road	0	02	93
"	934/3	0	07	32
"	934/4	0	00	50
"	934/1	0	05	77

का० आ० 3963. यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में डी एस कलोल 145 से जी जी एस VII तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पात्र अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप समक्ष प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बरोडा-9 को इस अधिभूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी मुतवाडे व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विभिन्न व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

[संख्या 11/2/72-एल एण्ड एन]

अनुसूची				
डी एस संख्या कलोल 145 से जी जी एस (कुओं के 144 के माग से) तक				
पाइप लाईन बिछाने के लिए				
राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—गांधीनगर	तालुका—गांधीनगर		
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	ए. आर. ई.	पी. ए. आर. ई.
तारपुर	156	0	7	76
	155/3	0	10	80
	155/2	0	12	17
	155/1	0	15	50
	154/1	0	03	66
उबरसय	857/पी	0	15	01
	858	0	01	77
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	00
	938/3	0	08	30
	935/3	0	02	93
	डी एस बी रोड	0		
	934/3	0	07	32
	934/4	0	00	50
	934/1	0	05	77

S.O. 3964.—Where as it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D.S.K. 148 to GGS VII in Gujarat State Pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

[No. 11/2/72-L&I.]

R. N. CHOPRA, Under Secy.

SCHEDULE

FOR LAYING PIPELINE FROM D.S.NO.K-148 TO G.G.S. VII (VIA WELL K-144)

STATE—Gujarat DIST—Gandhinagar		TALU—Gandhinagar		
Village	S.No.	Hectare	Are	P.Are
1	2	3	4	5
TARAPUR	124/15	0	02	29
"	124/6/10	0	00	50
"	124/5	0	05	07
"	124/3	0	05	53
"	124/1,2,9	0	10	91
"	124/4	0	05	19
"	125	0	06	67
"	V.P. Cart Track	0	00	73
"	131	0	11	53
"	130/3,130,129		06	34
"	131,132,152,153/1			
"	155/4	0	09	15
"	129,130/1,130/3	0	13	30
"	153/1,152,155/4			
"	130/1,130/2	0	05	43
"	153/2,153/3,154/2	0	10	01
"	Cart Track	0	01	71

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
UVARASAD	940/2	0	01	22
"	929/4	0	04	84
"	939/2/3	0	08	53
"	938/4	0	02	50
"	D.L.B. Road	0	05	06
"	938/1	0	08	50
"	935/3	0	04	59
"	934/1	0	07	81

का० आ० 3964—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में डी एस के 148 से जी जी एस VII तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एम्पवाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उस भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप समक्ष प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड बरोदा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चित यह भी कबन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तियों हों या किसी बिधि व्यवसायी की माफत।

[सं० 11/2/72 लेबर एण्ड वेजिस]

आर० एन० चोपड़ा, अवर सचिव

अनुसूची

डी एस संख्या के-148 से जी जी एस VII (कुओं संख्या के-144 के माग से) पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—गांधीनगर	तालुका—गांधीनगर		
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	ए. आर. ई.	पी. ए. आर. ई.
1	2	3		5
तारपुर	124/15	0	02	29
	124/6/10	0	00	50
	124/5	0	05	07
	124/3	0	05	53
	124/1,2,9	0	10	91
	124/4	0	05	19
	125	0	06	67
	124/1,2,9	0	10	91
	124/4	0	05	19
	125	0	06	67
	वी पी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	73
	131	0	11	53
	130/3, 130,	0	06	34
	129			

1	2	3	4	5
	131/132,	0	09	15
	152, 153/1,			
	154/4			
	129/130/1, 130/3		13	30
	152/153/1, 155/4	0	05	43
	130/1, 130/2			
	153/2, 153/3,	0	10	01
	154/2			
	कार्टेज	0	01	71
उत्तरसद	940/2	0	01	22
	940/4	0	04	84
	939/2/3	0	08	53
	938/4	0	02	50
	डी एल बी रोड	0	05	06
	938/1	0	08	50
	935/3	0	04	59
	934/1	0	07	81

COLLECTORATE OF CUSTOMS AND CENTRAL EXCISE

(Office of the Collector of Central Excise)

Hyderabad, the 4th March, 1971

(CENTRAL EXCISE)

S.O. 3965.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 2 (a) of the Produce Cess Act, 1966, and in supersession of the Notifications Nos. 8/69 CE dated 23-9-69 and 4/70 C.E. dated 20-7-70, I hereby authorise the Central Excise Officers specified in col. 4 of the table hereto annexed, to exercise within their respective jurisdiction powers of the Collector under the Section of the Produce Cess Act, 1966 enumerated in column 2 to the extent given in col. 3 of the said table:

Sl No. of the produce Cess Act 1966	Relevant Section	In regard to officers of the central excise to whom the powers are delegated	
1	2	3	4
1.	7	Furnishing particulars about the mill,	Superintendent Central excise,
2.	8	Submission of monthly returns,	—do—
3.	9 (1) and 9 (2)	Collection of cess	—do—
4.	12(a) (b) & (c)	Recovery of sums due.	—do—
5.	13 (1) & (2)	Power to inspect mills, etc,	Officers not below the rank of inspectors of central excise,
6.	16	Adjudication of offences.	Assistant collector of central excise,
7.	18	Composition of offences	—do

[No 1/71]

M. C. DAS, Collector.

केंद्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क और सीमा शुल्क, कार्यालय समाहर्ता
कार्यालय समाहर्ता, केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क ; हैदराबाद
हैदराबाद, दिनांक 4 मार्च, 1971

(केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क)

का.आ. 3965.—1966 को उत्पाद उपशुल्क अधिनियम की धारा 2 (क) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा दिनांक

23-8-69 व 20-7-70 की अधिसूचनाओं सं. 8/69 केंद्रीय उत्पादन और 4/70 केंद्रीय उत्पादन, का अधिक्रमण करते हुए, मैं एतद्वारा, उपावन्ध सारणी के स्तंभ चार में उल्लिखित केंद्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क के अधिकारियों को अपने-अपने अधिकार क्षेत्र में, स्तंभ 2 में बताई गई, 1966 के उत्पाद उपशुल्क, अधिनियम की धारा के अन्तर्गत, उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ 3 में दी गयी सीमाओं तक, समाहर्ता की शक्तियों का प्रयोग प्रधिकृत करता हूँ।

क० सं० 1966 के केंद्रीय निम्नांकित बातों के संबंध केंद्रीय उत्पाद के उन उत्पाद उपशुल्क में अधिकारियों के नाम अधिनियम की जिन्हें अधिकार प्रत्या- संगत धारा योजित किये जाते हैं

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	7	मिल के संबंध में दिया जाने वाला विवरण	अधीन, केंद्रीय उत्पा- दन शुल्क
2.	8	मासिक विवरणियों का प्रस्तुतीकरण	यथोपरि
3.	9 (1) और 9 (2)	उपशुल्क एकत्र करना	यथोपरि
4.	12(क) (ख) और (ग)	वेय राशि की वसूली	यथोपरि
5.	13 (1) और (2)	मिलों का निरीक्षण करने का अधिकार	वे प्राधिकारी जो निरी- क्षक से नीचे पद के आदि। नहीं हैं।
6.	16	अपराधों का न्याय	महायुक्त समाहर्ता, निर्यात केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क
7.	18	अपराधों का प्रशमन	यथोपरि

[सं-1/71]

एम. सी. दास, समाहर्ता

Hyderabad, the 18th November, 1971

S.O. 3966.—It is hereby notified that serial No. 6 in the table annexed to this office Notification (C. EX) No. 1/71 dated 4th March 1971, be deemed, hereinafter, to have been deleted.

[No. 3/71]

S. K. SRIVASTAVA, Collector.

हैदराबाद, 18 नवम्बर, 1971

का.आ. 3966.—एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि इस कार्यालय की दिनांक 4 मार्च 1971 की अधिसूचना (कें. उत्पा.) सं. 1/71 के साथ संलग्न सारणी की क्रम सं. 6 एतद्वारा विलुप्त समझी जाये।

[सं. 3/71]

एस. के. श्रीवास्तव, समाहर्ता।

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE

New Delhi, the 2nd November, 1972

S.O. 3967.—WHEREAS the Textiles Committee has established standard specifications and type of inspection for the purpose of export for the material defined in clause (e) of regulation 2 of the Man-made Fibre Fabrics (Inspection) Regulations, 1972;

AND WHEREAS on the recommendation made to it in this behalf by the Textiles Committee, the Central Government is of opinion that the material which does not conform to the standard specifications and type of inspection established by the Textiles Committee should not be exported;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Textiles Committee Act, 1963 (41 of 1963), the Central Government hereby prohibits the export from India to any foreign country of the

material defined in clause (c) of regulation 2 of the said regulations unless the material is covered by a certificate issued by the Officer authorised by the Textiles Committee in this behalf under regulation 11 thereof :

PROVIDED that, notwithstanding the above prohibition, if a genuine order is received from abroad for the supply of low quality material which does not pass the minimum inspection standards required for the issue of a certificate and if an Officer authorised by the Textiles Committee in this behalf is satisfied that the bonafides of such orders are beyond doubt, the export of such material may be authorised by him even though the quality of the material is below the minimum inspection standards.

2. This notification shall come into force on the 15th December, 1972.

[No. F. No. 25011(42)/71-Tem A]

T. KHANNA, Dy. Secy.

विदेश व्यापार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 22 नवम्बर, 1972

का.आ. 3967.—यत्—वस्त्र समिति ने मानक निर्मित तन्तु कड़ा के (निरीक्षण) विनियम, 1972 के विनियम 2 के खण्ड (ड.) में परिभाषित सामग्री का निर्यात करने के प्रयोजन के लिए मानक विनिर्देश और निरीक्षण के प्रकार स्थापित किए हैं:

और यत्: वस्त्र समिति द्वारा इस निमित्त उसे की गई सिफारिश पर केंद्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि जो सामग्री वस्त्र समिति द्वारा स्थापित मानक विनिर्देशों और निरीक्षण के प्रकार के अनुरूप नहीं है, वह निर्यात नहीं की जानी चाहिए:

अतः अब, वस्त्र समिति अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 41) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केंद्रीय सरकार, उक्त विनियम के विनियम 2 के खण्ड (ड.) में परिभाषित सामग्री का भारत से किसी विदेश को निर्यात का एतद्वारा तब तक के लिए प्रतिषेध करती है, जब तक वह सामग्री उक्त विनियम के विनियम 11 के अधीन इस निर्मित वस्त्र समिति द्वारा प्राधिकृत अधिकारी द्वारा दिए गए प्रमाणपत्र के अन्तर्गत न आती है :

परन्तु उपर्युक्त प्रतिषेध के होते हुए भी यदि विदेश से ऐसी निम्न क्वालिटी वाली सामग्री के, जो प्रमाणपत्र दिए जाने के लिए अपेक्षित न्यूनतम निरीक्षण मानक की नहीं है, प्रदाय के लिए कोई असली आदेश प्राप्त होता है और यदि इस निमित्त वस्त्र समिति द्वारा प्राधिकृत अधिकारी का यह समझाना हो जाता है कि ऐसे आदेशों की वास्तविकता संदेह से परे है तो सामग्री की क्वालिटी, उन न्यूनतम निरीक्षण मानकों से नीचे की होने पर भी ऐसी सामग्री का निर्यात उसके द्वारा प्राधिकृत किया जा सकेगा ।

2. यह अधिसूचना 15 दिसम्बर, 1972 को प्रवृत्त होगी ।

[सं. एफ 25011/42/71-टि-म-ए.]

टी. खन्ना, उप-सचिव ।

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

New Delhi, the 19th September, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 3968.—M/S. Karnatak Exports Limited, D 402, Defence Colony, New Delhi were granted transfer of Licence No. P/L/268648/C/XX/43/D/33-34 dt. 10-7-72 for Rs. 3,98,199/- under sub-clause 5(3) (i) of Imports (Control) Order 1965 (against REP licence of M/S Gedore Tools (India) Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi) for Col. 4 items against A.111.8 of Volume. II Red Book 1972-73.

The above transferee has filed an affidavit as required under para 318 read with Appendix 8 of Import Trade Hand Book

of Rules & Procedure 1972-73 wherein they have stated that Exchange Control copy of licence No. P/L/2686468/C/XX/43/D/33-34 dated 10-7-72 has been lost/misplaced by them without having been utilised at all. They have applied for duplicate copy of the licence for Rs. 3,98,199/- only.

I am satisfied, that the Exchange Control copy of licence No. P/L/2686468 dated 10-7-72 has been lost/misplaced.

Therefore, in exercise of the power conferred under subject Clause 9C in the Import Trade Control Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended up to date said Exchange Copy of the licence No. P/L/2686468 dated 10.7.72 is hereby cancelled and for which a duplicate Exchange Control copy of the licence has been applied for.

Duplicate copy of the Exchange Control copy of the Licence No. P/L/2686468 dated 10-7-72 for Rs. 3,98,199/- is being issued separately.

[No. Engg. 10/O.D.71/SC.I/CLA/2385]

(संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

नयी दिल्ली, 19 सितम्बर, 1972

आदेश

का० आ० 3968—सर्वश्री कर्नाटक एक्सपोर्ट लि०, डी-402 डिफेन्स कॉलोनी, नई दिल्ली को (सर्वश्री गेडूर टूल्स (इंडिया) प्रा० लि०, नई दिल्ली के आर० ई० पी लाइसेंस के मद्दे) आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1965 की उप धारा 5(3)(1) के अन्तर्गत 1972-73 के लिए रैंड बुक के वा० 2 के ए० 111.8 के सामने कालम 4 की मदों के आयात के लिए 3,98,199 रुपये के लाइसेंस सं० पी०/एल०/2686468/सी/एक्सएम/43/डी/33-34 दिनांक 10-7-72 के हस्तांतरण की स्वीकृति दी गई थी ।

हस्तांतरी ने आयात व्यापार नियम तथा कार्यविधि हेंड बुक 1972-73 की कंडिका 318 जिसे परिशिष्ट 8 के साथ पढ़े के अन्तर्गत अपेक्षित एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है जिसमें उन्होंने बताया है कि लाइसेंस सं० पी०/एल/2686468/सी/एक्सएम/43/डी/33-34 दिनांक 10-7-72 की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति बिल्कुल उपयोग किए बिना ही खो गई है/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। उन्होंने 3,98,199 रुपये मात्र के लिए लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि प्रति के लिए आवेदन किया है।

मैं संतुष्ट हूं कि लाइसेंस सं० पी०/एल/2686468 दिनांक 10-7-72 की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

इसलिए, अद्यतन यथासंशोधित आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की उपधारा 9 सी के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर लाइसेंस सं० पी०/एल/2686468 दिनांक 10-7-72 जिसकी अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति के लिए आवेदन किया गया है उसकी उपयुक्त मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

लाइसेंस संख्या पी०/एल/2686468 दिनांक 10-7-72 मूल्य 3,98,199 रुपये की अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[सं० इजी० 10/ओ.डी. 71/एस. सी. I/सी.एल. ए. 2385]

ORDER

S.O. 3969.—M/S. Karnatak Exports Limited, D-402, Defence Colony, New Delhi were granted transfer of licence No. P/L/2686469/C/XX/43/D/33-34 dated 10-7-72 for Rs. 1,74,550/- under sub-clause 5(3) (i) of Import (Control) Order 1965 (against REP licence of M/s. GEDORE TOOLS (INDIA) PVT. LTD., NEW DELHI) for Col. 4 items against A. 111.8 of Volume. II Red Book 1972-73.

The above transferee has filed an affidavit as required under para. 318 read with Appendix 8 of Import Trade Hand Book of Rules and Procedure 72-73 wherein they have stated that Exchange Control Copy of Licence No. P/L/2686469/C/XX/43/D/33-34 dated 10-7-72 has been lost/misplaced by them without having been utilised at all. They have applied for duplicate copy of the licence for Rs. 1,74,550/- only.

I am satisfied, that the Exchange Control copy of licence No. P/L/2686469/C/XX/43/D/33-34 dt. 10-7-72 for Rs. 1,74,550/- has been lost/misplaced.

Therefore, in exercise of the power conferred under subject Clause 9C in the Import Trade Control Order, 1965 dt. 7-12-1955 as amended upto date the said Exchange Copy of the licence No. P/L/2686469 dt. 10-7-72 is hereby cancelled and for which a duplicate Exchange Control copy of the licence has been applied for.

Duplicate copy of the Exchange Control copy of the licence No. P/L/2686469 dt. 10-7-72 for Rs. 1,74,550/- is being issued separately.

[No. Engg. 46/JS. 71/SC. I/CIA/2384]

आदेश

का० प्रा० 3969.—सर्वश्री कर्नाटक एक्सपोर्ट लि०, डी-402 डिफेन्स कालोनी नई दिल्ली को (सर्वश्री गेडूर टूलज (इंडिया) प्रा० लि० नई दिल्ली) के द्वार ई पी लाइसेंस के मद्दे आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1965 की उप धारा 5(3)(1) के अन्तर्गत 1972-73 के लिए रैडबुक के वा 2 के ए 111.8 के सामने कालम 4 की मदों के आयात के लिए 1,74,550 रुपये के लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686469/सी एक्स एक्स/43/डी/33-34 दिनांक 10-7-72 के हस्तान्तरण की स्वीकृति दी गई थी।

हस्तांतरी ने आयात व्यापार नियम तथा कार्यविधि, रैडबुक, 1972-73 की कंडिका 318 जिसे परिशिष्ट 8 के साथ पढ़े के अन्तर्गत अपेक्षित एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है जिसमें उन्होंने बताया है कि लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686469/सी/एक्स एक्स/43/डी/33-34 दिनांक 10-7-72 की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति बिल्कुल उपयोग किए बिना ही खो गई है/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। उन्होंने 1,74,550 रुपये मात्र के लिए लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि प्रति के लिए आवेदन किया है।

मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686469/सी/एक्स एक्स/43/डी/33-34 दिनांक 10-7-72 मूल्य, 1,74,550 रुपये की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

इसलिए, अध्ययन तथा संशोधित आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की उप धारा 9 सी के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686469 दिनांक 10-7-72 जिसकी अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति के लिए आवेदन किया गया है उसकी उपर्युक्त मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति एतद् द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686469 दिनांक 10-7-72 मूल्य 1,74,550 रुपये की अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[सं० इंजी० 46/जे. एस. 71/एस. सी. 1/सी. एल. ए/2384]

ORDER

S.O. 3970.—M/s. General Electronics, Opp. Tribune, Ambala Cantt were granted a duplicate import licence Customs purposes copy No. D. 2466458 for Rs. 32176 in lieu of original licence No. P/M/2611382 dated 31-8-70.

They have now reported that original licence No. P/M/2611382 dated 31.8.70 has been found.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under section 9(C) IMPORT TRADE CONTROL ORDER, 1955 dated 7.12.1955, I order the cancellation of duplicate Customs purposes copy of licence No. D.2466458 and cancellation of original licence No. P/M/2611382 dated 31.8.70 may be treated as withdrawn.

[File No. Engg. 92/JS. 68/SC.I/CLA/868].

आदेश

का० प्रा० 3970.—सर्वश्री जनरल इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स, ओपोजिट, ट्रिब्यूनल' अम्बाला को मूल लाइसेंस सं० पी/एम/2611382 दिनांक 31-8-70 के बदले में 32176 रुपये के लिए अनुलिपि लाइसेंस सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबंधी प्रति सं० डी० 2466458 स्वीकृत की गयी थी।

उन्होंने अब सूचना दी है कि मूल लाइसेंस सं० पी/एम/2611382 दिनांक 31-8-70 मिल गया है।

आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9(सी) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर मैं लाइसेंस सं० डी 2466458 की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबंधी को रद्द करने के लिए आदेश देता हूँ और मूल लाइसेंस सं० पी/एम/2611382 दिनांक 31-8-70 को रद्द करने का आदेश वापिस ले लिया गया समझा जाए।

[संख्या : पूंजी 92/जे एस० 68/एम सी-1/सी एल ए/868]

ORDER

S.O. 3971.—M/s. Karnatak Exports Limited, D-402, Defence Colony, New Delhi were granted transfer of licence No.P/L/2686483 dated 11.7.72 for Rs. 43,058/- under sub-clause 5(3) (i) of Import (Control) Order, 1965 (against R.E.P licence of M/S. Man Structural Pvt. Ltd., Near Loco, Jaipur) for Col.4 items against S.No.A.27.1 of Volume-II Red Book 1972-73.

The above transferee has filed an affidavit as required under para 318 read with Appendix, 8 of the Import Trade Hand Book of Rules and Procedure 72-73, wherein they have stated that Exchange Control copy of licence No.P/L/2686483/C/XX/43/D/33.34 dated 11-7-72 has been lost/misplaced by them without having been utilised at all. They have applied for Duplicate copy of the licence for Rs. 43,058 only.

I am satisfied, that the Exchange Control copy of licence No. P/L/2686483/C/XX/43/33.45 dated 11-7-72 has been lost/misplaced.

Therefore, in exercise of the power conferred under subject Clause 90 in the Import Trade Control Order, 1965 dt. 7-12-1955 as amended upto date the said Exchange Control copy of licence No. P/L/2686483/C/XX/43/D/33.34 dt. 11-7-72 is hereby cancelled and for which a Duplicate Exchange Control copy of the licence has been applied for.

Duplicate copy of the Exchange Control copy of licence No.P/L/2686483 dated 11.7.72 for Rs. 43,058/- is being issued separately.

[File No. Engg. 122/J.S.71/SC.I/CLA 2383.]

A. L. BHALLA, Dy. Chief Controller
for Jt. Chief Controller.

आदेश

का० प्रा० 3971.—सर्वश्री कर्नाटक एक्सपोर्ट लि०, डी-402 डिफेन्स कालोनी नई दिल्ली को (सर्वश्री मान स्ट्रक्चरल प्रा० लि० नीयर लोकों, जयपुर के द्वार ई पी लाइसेंस के मद्दे आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1965 की उपधारा 5(3)(1) के अन्तर्गत 1972-73 के लिए रैडबुक के वा० 2 के ए. 111.8 के सामने कालम 4म की मदों के आयात के लिए 43,058 रुपये के लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686483 दिनांक 11-7-72 के हस्तान्तरण की स्वीकृति दी गई थी।

हस्तांतरी ने आयात व्यापार नियम तथा कार्यविधि रैडबुक 1972-73 की कंडिका 318 जिसे परिशिष्ट 8 के साथ पढ़े के अन्तर्गत अपेक्षित एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है जिसमें उन्होंने बताया है कि लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686483/सी एक्स एक्स/43/डी/33-34 दिनांक 11-7-72 की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति बिल्कुल उपयोग किए बिना ही खो गई

है/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है। उन्होंने 43,058 रुपये मात्र के लिए लाइसेंस की प्रनुलिपि प्रति के लिए भ्रावेदन किया है।

मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686483/सी/एक्स एक्स/43/बी/33-34 दिनांक 11-7-72 मूल्य 43,058 रुपये की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

इसलिए, भव्यतन यथासंशोधित आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की उप धारा 9 सी के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686483/सी एक्स एक्स/43/बी/33-34 दिनांक 11-7-72 जिसकी प्रनुलिपि मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति के लिए भ्रावेदन किया गया है उसकी उपर्युक्त मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

लाइसेंस सं० पी/एल/2686483 दिनांक 11-7-72 मूल्य 43,058 रुपये की प्रनुलिपि मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति भ्रम से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या : इजी. 122/जे० एम० 71/एम० सी०-1/सी० एल० ए०/2383]

ए० एल० भल्ला, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक
कृत संयुक्त-नियंत्रक

Madras, the 30th June, 1972

From

Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Madras.

To

M/s. Southern Steel Industries, 161, T.H. Road,
Madras-21.

Notice under clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended for cancellation of an import licence.

S.O. 3972.—Whereas you obtained from Dy. Assistant Iron and Steel Controller, Madras three import licences No. P/S/8539257 to 8539259 dt. 15-1-1971 for the value of Rs. 4950/- and 2475/- each for the import of Prime B. P. Sheets.

2. And whereas, information has been received that registered letter sent you was returned undelivered with remarks "left".

3. And whereas it is proposed to cancel the said licence under clause 9(a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended for the reason that the licences will not serve the purpose for which they have been granted.

4. Now, therefore, you or any Bank or any other party having interest in the said three licences P/S/8539257 to P/S/8539259, dt. 15-1-1971 are called upon to show by/within 15 days why action as proposed should not be taken to cancel the said licence.

5. You are also requested to state if you require a personal hearing in the matter or you may book an interview with the undersigned on any working day within the stipulated period in para 4 above, through the Enquiry Officer of this office.

6. If no reply is received within the stipulated period, it will be presumed that you have nothing to say in the matter and a decision will be taken ex-parte on merits.

[No. JC/I&S/238/ENF/71/1158.]
M. F. R. BIJLI, Dy. Chief Controller.

मद्रास, 30 जून, 1972

प्रेषक :

संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात, मद्रास।
सेवा में

सर्वश्री साउदर्न स्टील इन्डस्ट्रीज, 161, टी. एस. रोड,
मद्रास-21।

का. आ. 3972.—आयात लाइसेंस को रद्द करने के लिये यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955, दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 के अन्तर्गत नोटिस।

चूँकि आपने प्राइम बी. पी. शीट के आयात के लिए उप-सहायक लोहा तथा इस्पात नियंत्रक, मद्रास से तीन आयात लाइसेंस संख्या : डी/एस/8539257 से 8539259, दिनांक 15-1-71 प्राप्त किया था जिनमें प्रत्येक का मूल्य 4,950 रुपये और 2,475 रुपये था।

2. और चूँकि सूचना मिली है कि आपके पास भेजा गया रीजिस्टर्ड लेटर "स्थान छोड़ दिया है" इस टिप्पणी के साथ किसी के द्वारा बिना प्राप्त किये ही लौट आया है।

3. और चूँकि यह विचार किया जा रहा है कि उक्त लाइसेंस को यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9(ए) के अनुसार रद्द कर दिया जाए क्योंकि लाइसेंस उन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति नहीं करेंगे जिसके लिए वे प्रदान किए गए हैं।

4. अब आप या कोई बैंक या कोई अन्य पार्टी जो इन उक्त तीन लाइसेंसों पी/एस/8539257 से 8539259, दिनांक 15-1-71 में दिलखसती रखती हो तो 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण लिखकर दें कि उक्त लाइसेंस को रद्द करने के संबंध में यथा प्रस्तावित कार्यवाई क्यों न की जाए।

5. आप से यह अनुरोध किया जाता है कि यदि आप इस मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई चाहते हैं या अधोहस्ताक्षरी से उपर्युक्त काँड़का 4 में निर्धारित अवधि के भीतर किसी भी कार्यालय जिस में इस कार्यालय के पूछताछ अधिकारी के माध्यम से मिल सकें तो इसे भी बताएँ।

6. यदि निर्धारित अवधि के भीतर कोई उत्तर नहीं आया तो यह समझा जायगा कि आपको इस मामले में कुछ नहीं कहना है और मामले में गुणावगुण के आधार पर एक तरफा कारवाई की जायगी।

[संख्या : जेसी/आईएनएस/238/ईएनएफ/71/1158.]

एम. एफ. आर. बिजली, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक।

(Office of the Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

Fridabad, the 3rd August, 1972

CANCELLATION ORDER

S.O. 3973.—M/s. Swastik Tin Works, D. 11 Industrial Estate, Aligarh were granted an import licence No. P/S/8546313/T/OR/38/D/31-32 dated 22-2-71 for Rs. 18,163/- and Letter of Authority issued in favour of M/s. Hari Chand Kashmiri Lal, Delhi for the item P.C. R.C.A. Sheets Cuttings and Defective Sheets revalidated upto 31-8-72 under Rupee Ceiling for April/March, 71 period with port of Registration, Calcutta. They have applied for the duplicate Exchange Control and Custom

Clearance Purposes copies of the said licence and Letter of Authority on the ground that original E. C. P. and C. C. P. copies of the said licence and Letter of Authority have been lost/misplaced. It is further stated that the original licence and Letter of Authority were not registered with any Custom Authorities and were not utilised at all.

In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that original ECP and CCP copies of the aforesaid licence and Letter of Authority have been lost/misplaced and direct that duplicate ECP and CCP copies should be issued to the applicant in cancellation of original ECP & CCP copies of the licence and Letter of Authority;

[No. N.P/P-5/AM.71/Exist|AUD|AISCD|LC.III].

(उप मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

फरीदाबाद, 3 अगस्त, 1972

आवेश

का. आ. 3973.—सर्वश्री स्वस्तिक टिन वर्क्स, डी. 11 इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, अलीगढ़ को 18,163 रुपये मूल्य के लिए एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/एस/8546313/टी/ओ आर/38/डी/31.32 दिनांक 22-2-71 प्रदान किया गया था और कलकत्ता पत्तन पर पंजीकरण की शर्त के साथ अप्रैल/मार्च 71 अवधि के लिए रूपया सीलिंग के अधीन पी.सी. आर.सी.ए. शीट्स कोटिंग्स तथा डिफ़ीक्रेटव शीट्स मद के लिए 31.8.72 तक पुनर्विध प्राधिकार पत्र सर्वश्री हरी चन्द कश्मीरी लाल, दिल्ली को जारी किया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस और प्राधिकार पत्र की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण और सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रतियों की अनुलिपियों के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि इनकी मूल प्रतियां खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं। यह भी उल्लेख किया गया है कि मूल लाइसेंस और प्राधिकार पत्र किसी सीमाशुल्क प्राधिकारी से पंजीकृत नहीं कराये थे और उनका उपयोग बिल्कुल नहीं किया गया था।

इस तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि पूर्वोक्त लाइसेंस और प्राधिकार पत्र की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति और सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं और निदेश देता हूँ कि उन मूल प्रतियों को रद्द करते हुए इनकी अनुलिपियां आवेदक को जारी की जानी चाहिए।

[संख्या: एन पी/ए. 5/ए एम. 71/एकीजस्ट/एयू यू पी/ए आई एम सी डी/एल सी/3.]

The 28th August, 1972

CANCELLATION

ORDER

S.O. 3974.—M/s. Raghuvir Group of Industries, Rohtak Road, Charkhi Dadri (Hararyana) were granted import licences Nos. P/S/8560392/C/XX/41/D/33.34. (ii) P/S/8560394/R/ML/41/D/33/34 MLI both dated 6.10.71 (iii) P/S/8561085/C/XX/41/D/33.34. (iv) P/S/8561087/R/ML/41/D/33.34. MLI both dated 16.12.71 for Rs. 63,000/-, Rs. 31,500/-, Rs. 21,000/- for Rs. 10,500/- respectively for AM. 72 period with port of Regn. Bombay. They have applied for issue of duplicate ECP and CCP copy of the said import licences on the grounds that original ECP and CCP copy of the said import licences have been lost/displaced. It is further stated that the original licences were not registered with any custom authorities and were not utilised at all.

In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original ECP and CCP copy of the said import licences have been lost/displaced and direct

that duplicate ECP and CCP should be issued to the applicant in cancellation of original ECP and CCP copy of the licences in question.

[No. P/R-10AM.72|NU|AUH|ISCD.]

K. N. KAPOOR, Dy. Chief Controller.

दिनांक 18 अगस्त, 1972

आवेश

का.आ. 3974.—सर्वश्री रघुवीर ग्रुप आफ इंडस्ट्रीज, रोहतक रोड, चरखी दादरी (हरियाणा) को अप्रैल-मार्च 1972 अवधि के लिए बंबई पंजीयन-पतन के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्याएं पी/एस/8560392/सी/एस एस/41/डी/33-34, (2) पी/एस/8560394/आर/एमएल/41/डी/33-34/एमएल-1 दोनों का दिनांक 6-10-71 है, (3) पी/एस/8561085/सी/एसएस/41/डी/33-34, (4) पी/एस/8561087/आर/एमएल/41/डी/33-34/एमएल-1, दोनों का दिनांक 16-12-71 है क्रमशः 63,000 रुपये, 31,500 रुपये, 21,000 रुपये, 10,500 रुपये मूल्य के लिए स्वीकृत किए गए थे। उन्होंने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंसों की अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण तथा सीमाशुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रतियों के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण तथा सीमाशुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रतियां खो गई हैं/अस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं। आगे यह बताया गया है कि मूल लाइसेंस किसी भी सीमाशुल्क प्राधिकारियों के पास पंजीकृत नहीं कराए गए थे और उनका बिल्कुल उपयोग नहीं किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथपत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंसों की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण तथा सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबन्धी प्रतियां खो गई हैं और निदेश देता हूँ कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंसों की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण तथा सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबन्धी प्रतियों को रद्द करते हुए आवेदक को अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण तथा सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबन्धी प्रतियां जारी की जानी चाहिए।

[संख्या : पी/आर-10/एस.72/एसयू/एयूएस/आईएससीडी.]

कै. एन. कपूर, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक।

Hyderabad. the 24th October, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 3975.—M/s. Vijaya Viswaswara Industries, 16-39-18/A, Bhoopathi Chalapathi Rao Street, 10th Ward, Tenali obtained the following licences in the category of 'Actual Users'.

1. P/Y/1636360/C/XX/35/W/29-30, dt. 12-5-70.
2. P/S/1238741/C/XX/38/W/31-32, dt. 1-2-71.
3. P/S/1238742/R/ML/38/W/31-32, dt. 1-2-71.
4. P/S/1238743/T/OR/38/W/31-32, dt. 1-2-71.

The said licences were subject to the following Conditions interalia:—

"that all items of goods imported under these licences shall be used only in the licence holder's factory at the address shown in the application against which these licences were issued and that the purpose for which the licences were issued on may be processed in the factory of another manufacturing unit, but no portion thereof shall be sold to any other party or utilised or permitted to be used in any other manner."

(2) A Show Cause Notice No. DCHY/177/Enf/71-72, dt. 13-9-72 under Clause 10 of the Import (Control) Order 1955 as amended for taking action under Clause 8 of the said order was issued M/s. Vijaya Vishweswara Industries, 16-39-18/A, Bhoopathi Chalapathi Rao Street 10th ward, Tenali stating that the under signed has reasons to believe that the goods imported against the licences have not been properly utilised in terms of the conditions imposed on and applicable to the licences.

(3) The aforesaid show cause notice issued to M/s. Vijaya Vishweswara Industries, 16-39-18/A, Bhoopathi Chalapathi Rao Street, 10th ward, Tenali has been received back undelivered.

(4) The under signed has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the unit is not in existence and the goods imported under said licences have not been utilised for the purpose for which those were issued.

(5) From what has been stated above the under signed is satisfied that M/s. Vijaya Vishweswara Industries, 16-39-18/A, Bhoopathi Chalapathi Rao Street, 10th Ward, Tenali have committed the breach/irregularity under Clause 8 of the Import (Control) Order 1955 as amend. Therefore the undersigned in exercise of the powers conferred under Clause 8 of the Import (Control) Order 1955 do hereby keeping in view the circumstances of the case debar M/s. Vijaya Vishweswara Industries, 16-39-18/A, Bhoopathi Chalapathi Rao Street, 10th Ward, Tenali and its proprietor Shri K. Mohan Rao from receiving import licences Customs clearance permits and allotments through the State Trading Corporation of India/Minerals and Metals Trading Corporation of India or any other similar agency for five licensing periods viz., April-March '72; April-March '73; April-March '74; April-March '75 and April-March '76.

(6) The order shall also apply to the proprietor of the said firm.

(7) In case M/s. Vijaya Vishweswara Industries, 16-39-18/A, Bhoopathi Chalapathi Rao Street, 10th Ward, Tenali are not satisfied with the above decision, they may, if they so desire, prefer an appeal to the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports, New Delhi within a month from the date of this order.

The 28th October, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 3976.—M/s. Gowri Shanker Industries, No. 44/3RT, Vijayanagar Colony Hyderabad-28 obtained the following import licences.

1. P/S/1696899/C/XX/40/W/31-32, dt. 23-7-71 for Rs. 5,000/-
2. P/S/1696901/T/OR/40/W/31-32, dt. 23-7-71 for Rs. 2,500/-
3. P/S/1696900/R/ML/40/W/31-32, dt. 23-7-71 for Rs. 2,500/-
4. P/S/1678731/C/XX/37/W/31-32, dt. 2-12-70 for Rs. 5,000/-
5. P/S/1678732/T/OR/37/W/31-32, dt. 2-12-70 for Rs. 2,500/- and
6. P/S/1678733/R/ML/37/W/31-32, dt. 2-12-70 for Rs. 2,500/-.

The said licences were subject to the following conditions *inter alia*:—

"that all items of goods imported under these licences shall be used only in the licence holder's factory at the address shown in the application against which the licences were issued and that the purpose for which the licences were issued on may be processed in the factory of another manu-

facturing unit, but no portion thereof shall be sold to any other party or utilised on permitted to be used in any other manner."

(2) A show cause notice No. DC/Hyd/116/Enf/70-71, dt. 19-9-72 under Clause 10 of the Import (Control) Order 1955 as amended for taking action under Clause 8 of the said order was issued to M/s. Gowri Shanker Industries, No. 44/3RT, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad-28 stating that the under signed has reasons to believe that the goods imported against the licences have not been properly utilised in terms of the conditions imposed on and applicable to the licences in as much as the factory is not in existence.

(3) The afore said show cause notice issued to M/s. Gowri Shanker Industries, No. 44/3RT, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad-28 has been returned back un-delivered.

(4) The under signed has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the unit is not in existence and the goods imported under the said licences had not been utilised for the purpose for which these were granted.

(5) From what has been stated above the under signed is satisfied that M/s. Gowri Shanker Industries, No. 44/3RT, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad-28 have committed the breach/irregularity under Clause 8 of Import (Control) Order 1955 as amended. Therefore the undersigned in exercise of the powers conferred under clause of imports control order 1955 do hereby keeping in view the circumstances of the case debar M/s. Gowri Shanker Industries, No. 44/3RT, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad-28 and its partners from receiving import licences, customs clearance permits and allotments through the State Trading Corporation of India/Minerals & Metals Trading Corporation of India or any other similar agency for five licensing periods viz., April-March, '72; April-March '73; April-March '74; April-March '75; and April-March '76.

(6) The order shall also apply to the partners of the said firms.

(7) In case M/s. Gowri Shanker Industries, No. 44/3RT, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad-28 are not satisfied with the above decision, they may if they so desire prefer an appeal to the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, New Delhi *with in a month* from the date of this order.

The 7th November, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 3977.—M/s. Amardeep Industries, No. 15-39-18, Paruchurivari Street, Burrupalem Road, Tenali, obtained the following licences in the category of 'Actual Users'.

1. P/Y/1636363/C/XX/35/W/29-30, dt. 12-5-70 for Rs. 5,000/-
2. P/S/1692545/T/OR/38/W/31-32, dt. 12-2-71 for Rs. 2,500/-
3. P/S/1692544/C/XX/38/W/31-32, dt. 12-2-71 for Rs. 5,000/- and
4. P/S/1692546/R/ML/38/W/31-32, dt. 12-2-71 for Rs. 2,500/-.

The said licences were issued subject to the following conditions *inter alia*:—

"that all items of goods imported under these licences shall be used only in the licence holder's factory at the address shown in the application against which these licences were issued and for the purpose for which these licences were issued or may

be processed in the factory another manufacturing unit but no portion thereof shall be sold to any other party or permitted to be used in any other manner."

(2) A Show Cause Notice No. DC|Hyd|177|Enf|71-72, dated 13-9-72 under Clause 10 of the Import (Control) Order 1955 as amended for taking action under Clause 8 of the said order was issued to M/s. Amardeep Industries, 15-39-18, Paruchurivari Street, Burrupalam Road, Tenali stating that the undersigned has reasons to believe that the goods imported against the licences have not been properly utilised in terms of the conditions imposed on and applicable to the licences.

(3) The above Show Cause Notice has not been responded to, within the time limit of 15 days from the date of receipt of the Show Cause Notice as per the Show Cause Notice nor subsequently.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the goods imported under the said licences have not been utilised for the purpose for which these were issued.

(5) From what has been stated above the undersigned is satisfied that M/s. Amardeep Industries, 15-39-18, Paruchurivari Street, Burrupalam Road, Tenali have committed the breach/irregularity under Clause 8 of the Import (Control) Order 1955 as amended. Therefore the undersigned in exercise of the powers conferred under Clause 8 of the Import (Control) Order 1955 do hereby keeping in view of the circumstances of the case debar M/s. Amardeep Industries, 15-39-18, Paruchurivari Street, Burrupalam Road, Tenali and its proprietor Shri K. Shesharatnam from receiving Import licences; customs clearance permits and allotments through State Trading Corporation of India/Minerals & Metals Trading Corporation of India or any other similar agency for five licensing periods viz., April-March 1972; April-March '73; April-March '74; April-March '75 and April-March '76.

(6) The order shall also apply to the proprietor of the said firm.

(7) In case M/s. Amardeep Industries, 15-39-18, Paruchurivari Street, Burrupalam Road, Tenali are not satisfied with the above decision, they may if they so desire prefer an appeal to the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports, New Delhi within a month from the date of this order.

[No. DCHY|177|Enf|71-72|337]

R. JAYARAM NAIDU, Dy. Chief Controller.

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 3978.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended, the undersigned hereby cancels the Customs Purposes Copy of the Licence No. G|CG|2027856|D|BE|30|H|28|CG II dated 27-2-1969 for Rs. 1,27,45,475 (One Crore, Twenty Seven Lakhs, Forty Five Thousand, Four Hundred and Seventy Five Only) issued to the Fertilizer Corporation of India Ltd., Planning & Development Division, P.O. Sindri, District Dhanbad. The original Customs Purposes Copy of the licence was utilised for Rs. 1,05,39,362/-.

2. The reason for the cancellation is that the Customs Purposes Copy of the licence has been lost/misplaced by the licensee who has requested for the issue of a duplicate Licence in lieu thereof.

M. E. THOMAS, Dy. Chief Controller.

For Chief Controller.

[No. CG II|37(11)|68-69.]

मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1972

का.आ. 3978.—यथा संशोधित आयात (निर्यात) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी फर्टीलाइजर कारपो. आफ इंडिया लि., योजना और विकास प्रभाग, डा. सिन्दरी, जिला धनबाद को 1,27,45,475 रुपये (एक करोड़ सत्ताईस लाख पैंतालीस हजार चार सौ पचहत्तर रुपये मात्र) के लिए जारी किए गए लाइसेंस सं. जी/सी जी/2027856/डी/बी ई/30/एच/28/सी.जी. 2 दिनांक 27-2-69 को एतद्द्वारा रद्द करता है। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति का 1,05,39,362 रुपये तक उपयोग कर लिया गया था।

2. लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति रद्द करने का कारण यह है कि वह उस लाइसेंसधारी से खा गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई थी जिसने उसके बदले में लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए आवेदन किया है।

[संख्या सी.जी. 2/37(11)/68-69.]

एम. ई. थॉमस, उप-मुख्य निर्यातक
कृष्य मुख्य निर्यातक

New Delhi, 21 November, 1972

S.O. 3979.—M/s. Buckau Wolf New India Engg. Works Ltd., 72 Medown Street, Fort, Bombay were granted an import licence No. P|D|2183521|S|AN|39|H|31.32 dated 18-6-1971 worth Rs. 83,000/- under US Aid Loan No. 386-H-207 for the import of Raw Materials/Components as per list attached to licence No. P|D|2175589 dated 3rd November, 1970 (other than banned/canalised as per Import Policy for AM 72). They have now requested this office to issue Duplicate Custom Copy of the said licence as the original one has been misplaced without being utilised, after it was submitted to the Asstt. Collector of Customs, Bombay. Duplicate Custom Copy requested is for the full amount of Rs. 83,000 (Rupee eighty-three thousand only). In support of this request, the party have furnished an affidavit.

The undersigned is satisfied that original Custom Copy of import licence No. P|D|2183521|S|AN dated 18th June 1971 has been misplaced and directs that a Duplicate Custom Copy may be issued. The original Custom Copy of above licence is hereby cancelled.

[No. File No. Mach-B-2(2-4)/AM71/RM4/2123]

A. K. SARKAR, Dy. Chief Controller.

नई दिल्ली, 21 नवम्बर, 1972

आवेश

का. आ. 3979.—सर्वश्री ब्यूको वुल्फ न्यू इंडिया इंजी. वर्क्स लि. 72, मिडोउन स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट, बंबई को यू. एस. सहायता ऋण संख्या 386एच-207 के अन्तर्गत लाइसेंस संख्या. पी/डी/2175589, दिनांक 3-11-70 के साथ संलग्न सूची के अनुसार कच्चे माल/संघटकों अप्रैल-मार्च, 72 आयात नीति के अनुसार निषेध/संयोजित मदों को छोड़ कर) का आयात करने के लिए 83,000 रुपये का एक आयात लाइसेंस संख्या. पी/डी/2183521/एस/एन/39/एच/31-32, दिनांक 18-6-71 स्वीकृत किया गया था। अब उन्होंने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल प्रति सहायक सीमाशुल्क समाहर्ता, बम्बई को प्रस्तुत करने के बाद बिना उपयोग किए ही अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। अब पूरे

मूल्य अर्थात् 83,000 रूपये के लिए अनुमतिपत्र प्रती के लिए आवेदन किया है। इस आवेदन के समर्थन में पार्टी ने एक शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है।

अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/डी/2183521/एस/एस/दिनांक 18-6-71 की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रती अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और निदेश देता है कि उन्हें अनुमतिपत्र सीमाशुल्क प्रती जारी की जाए। उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रती एतद् द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या : मक-बी-2(2-4)एस.71/आर एस-4/2123.]

ए. के. सरकार, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक।

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1972

S.O. 3980.—In pursuance of sub-regulation 14 of regulation 15 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-1728, particulars of which are given below, has been cancelled with effect from 16 September 1972, since the firm is no longer interested to operate the licence.

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Name & Address of the Licensee
1	2	3
1.	CM/L-1728 25-6-1968	The Indian Steel Rolling Mills Ltd, Main Road, Tiruniravur, (Chingleput Distt) having their Office at 108, Armenian Street, (Oriental Building), Madras-1
Article/Process covered by the Licence cancelled		Relevant Indian Standard
4		5
Hot Rolled Mild Steel Medium Tensile and High Yield Strength Steel Deformed Bars for Concrete Reinforcement		IS:1139-1966 Specification for Hot Rolled Mild Steel Medium Tensile and High Yield Strength Deformed Bars for Concrete Reinforcement (Revised)

[No. CMD/55: 1728]

M. V. PATANKAR, Dy. Director General.

औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय

भारतीय मानक संस्था

नयी दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1972

क्र० प्र० 39 80—समय-समय पर संगोष्ठित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन बिन्दु) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संख्या सी एम/एल-1728 जिसके ब्योरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, 16 सितम्बर, 1972 से रद्द कर दिया गया है क्योंकि फर्म लाइसेंस को जारी रखने की इच्छा नहीं है:—

अनुसूची

क्रम लाइसेंस सं० और निधि संख्या	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता
1. सी एम/एल-1728 (26-6-1968)	दि इंडियन स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स लि०, मैन रोड, तिरुनिरवूर (चिंगलपेट जिला) कार्यालय : 108, आर्मेनियन स्ट्रीट (ओरिएण्टल बिल्डिंग) मद्रास-1
रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु प्रक्रिया	तत्संबंधी भारतीय मानक
कंक्रीट प्रबलन के लिए गर्म बेलित मृदु इस्पात की मध्यम तनाव वाली और उच्च पराभव सामर्थ्य वाली इस्पात की विकृत सरिया	IS : 1139-1966 कंक्रीट प्रबलन के लिए गर्म बेलित मृदु इस्पात की मध्यम तनाव वाली और उच्च पराभव सामर्थ्य वाली इस्पात की विकृत सरिया (पुनरोचित)

[सं सी० एम० डी/55 : 728]

एम० वी० पाटनकर, उपमहाविशेषक

MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES

(Department of Mines)

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1972

ERRATA

S.O. 3981.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Steel and Mines (Department of Mines) No. S.O. 4055, dated the 14th October, 1971, published in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of Gazette of India, dated the 30th October, 1971 (pages 5797 to 5804), at page 5799:

- in line 4, for 'boul'n' read 'boun-'
- in line 8, for 'boul'n' read 'boun-',
- in line 9, for 'Cao' read 'Coal'
- in line 12, for 'plot No. 24/1 an' read 'plot No. 24/1 and',
- in lines 16, and 17, for 'Su Block-A' read 'Sub Block-A',
- in line 18, for 'comm' read 'common',
- in line 19, for 'section 9' read 'section 9(1)',
- in line 20, for 'S.O. 27' read 'S.O. 2760',
- in line 35, for 'section 9(10)' read 'section 9(1)',
- in line 36, for 'S.O. 276' read 'S.O.2760',

पृष्ठ संख्या 5801

पंक्ति संख्या 3 में

" पायबोरा " के लिए

" पायाबोरा " पढ़ें

पंक्ति संख्या 31 में

" 03-61 हेक्टेयर के लिए

" 23-61 हेक्टेयर " पढ़ें

[No. C3-2(10)/70-CS]

A. S. DESHPANDE, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 21st November, 1972

S.O. 3982.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 20 of the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 (36 of 1972), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Justice Krishna Ballabh Narayan Singh as the Commissioner of Payments for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such Commissioner of Payments by or under the said Act with effect from 1st November, 1972.

[File No. 20(32)/72-CI.]

S. K. DHAR, Dy. Secy.

इस्पात और खान मंत्रालय

(खान विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 नवम्बर, 1972

अधिसूचना

का.आ. 3982.—कोककर कोयला खान (राष्ट्रीयकरण) अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 38) की धारा 20 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, न्यायमूर्ति श्री कृष्ण वल्लभ नारायण सिंह को, 1 नवम्बर, 1972 से संवत् आयुक्त के रूप में, उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा अथवा के अधीन ऐसे संवत् आयुक्त को समनुद्देशित कृत्यों का पालन करने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 20/32/72-को. 1.]

एस. के. धर, उप सचिव।

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 9th November, 1972

S.O. 3983.—In pursuance of clause (d) of rule 2 of the Indian Medical Council Rules, 1957, the Central Government hereby appoints Dr. D. Ramanath, Additional Director of Medical and Health Services, Andhra Pradesh, as Returning Officer for the conduct of election of a member to the Medical Council of India under clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956) in the State of Andhra Pradesh.

[No. V. 11013/1/72-MPT]

K. SATYANARAYANA, Dy Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 नवम्बर, 1972

का.अ. 3983.—भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् की नियमावली, 1957 के नियम 2 के भाग (घ) का अनुसरण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् अधिनियम 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के भाग (ग) के अन्तर्गत, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में राज्य में एक सदस्य का चुनाव करने हेतु आन्ध्र प्रदेश के चिकित्सा एवं स्वास्थ्य सेवा के अतिरिक्त निदेशक, डा० जी० रामनाथ को निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. वी० 11013/1/72 एम० पी० टी०]

के० सत्यनारायण, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1972

S.O. 3984.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and clause (ii) of sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Service (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, the President hereby makes the following further amendments to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Agriculture No. S.R.O. 634-A, dated the 28th February, 1957, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification,

(i) In Part I—General Central Services Class III,

under the heading "Directorate of Marketing and Inspection" for the existing entries in columns 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

Description of posts	Appointing authority		
(1)	(2)		
"1. All posts in the Head Office only.	Director of Administration.		
2. All posts in the Central Agmark Laboratory, Nagpur only.	Director of Laboratories.		
3. All posts other than those in the Central Agmark Laboratory, Nagpur and the Head Office.	Joint Agricultural Marketing Adviser.		
Disciplinary authority to impose penalties	Nature of penalties	Appellate authority	
(3)	(4)	(5)	
Director of Administration	All	Agricultural Marketing Adviser	Marketing Adviser.
Director of Laboratories	All	Agricultural Marketing Adviser	Marketing Adviser.
Joint Agricultural Marketing Adviser.	All	Agricultural Marketing Adviser."	Marketing Adviser."

(ii) In Part II—General Central Service, Class IV, Under the heading "Director of marketing and Inspection" for the existing entries in columns 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

Description of posts	Appointing authority	
(1)	(2)	
1. All posts in the Head Office only.	Director of Administration,	Administration.
2. All posts in the Central Agmark Laboratory, Nagpur, only.	Director of Laboratories.	Laboratories.
3. All posts other than those in the Central Agmark Laboratory, Nagpur and the Head Office.	Joint Agricultural Marketing Adviser.	Marketing Adviser.
Disciplinary authority to impose penalties	Nature of penalties	Appellate authority
(3)	(4)	(5)
Director of Administration	All	Agricultural Marketing Adviser.
Director of Laboratories	All	Agricultural Marketing Adviser.
Joint Agricultural Marketing Adviser.	All	Agricultural Marketing Adviser."

[No. F. No. 1-4/72 C&M]

T. D. MAKHIJANI, Under Secy.

कृषि मंत्रालय

(कृषि विभाग)

नयी दिल्ली, 17 नवम्बर, 1972

का० अ० 3984.—राष्ट्रपति, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उपनियम (2), नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के खण्ड (ख) और नियम 24 के उपनियम (1) के खण्ड (II) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के कृषि मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० नि० 634-क तारीख 28 फरवरी, 1957 में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करते हैं, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में,

(I) भाग-1—साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा वर्ग 3 में,

“विपणन और निरीक्षण निदेशालय” शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत, स्तम्भ 1, 2, 3, 4 और 5 में विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर क्रमशः निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

पदों का वर्णन	नियुक्त प्राधिकारी
1	2
1. केवल प्रधान कार्यालय के सभी पद	प्रशासन निदेशक
2. केवल केन्द्रीय एगमार्क प्रयोगशाला नागपुर के सभी पद	प्रयोगशाला, निदेशक
3. केन्द्रीय एगमार्क प्रयोगशाला, नागपुर विपणन और प्रान कार्यालय के पदों से भिन्न सभी पद	संयुक्त कृषि विपणन सलाहकार

शास्तियाँ अधिरोपित करने के लिए अनुशासनिक प्राधिकारी	शास्तियों की प्रकृत	अपील प्राधिकारी
---	---------------------	-----------------

3	4	5
प्रशासन निदेशक	सभी प्रकार की	कृषि विपणन सलाहकार
प्रयोगशाला निदेशक	सभी प्रकार की	कृषि विपणन सलाहकार
संयुक्त कृषि विपणन सलाहकार	सभी प्रकार की	कृषि विपणन सलाहकार

(II) भाग 2—साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा वर्ग 4 में :—

“विपणन और निरीक्षण निदेशालय” शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत, स्तम्भ 1, 2, 3, 4 और 5 में विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर क्रमशः निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

1	2
“1. केवल प्रधान कार्यालय के सभी पद	प्रशासन निदेशक
2. केवल केन्द्रीय एगमार्क प्रयोगशाला, नागपुर के सभी पद	प्रयोगशाला-निदेशक
3. केन्द्रीय एगमार्क प्रयोगशाला, नागपुर, और प्रधान कार्यालय के पदों से भिन्न सभी पद।	संयुक्त कृषि विपणन सलाहकार

3	4	5
प्रशासन निदेशक	सभी प्रकार की	कृषि विपणन सलाहकार
प्रयोगशाला निदेशक	सभी प्रकार की	कृषि विपणन सलाहकार
संयुक्त कृषिविपणन	सभी प्रकार की	कृषि विपणन सलाहकार

[सं० 1-4/72. सी एण्ड एम] टी० डी० मखी जानी, अवरसचिव

(Department of Co-operation)

New Delhi, the 31st October, 1972

S.O. 3985.—On appointment as Managing Director, Rural Electrification Corporation Limited, the services of Shri M. M. K. Wali, an Indian Administrative Service Officer of the Rajasthan cadre and Secretary National Cooperative Development Corporation, New Delhi, are placed at the disposal of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power with effect from the afternoon of the 30th September, 1972.

[F.No.L-12013/6/71-MWS.]

A. DAS, Jt. Secy.

(सहकारिता विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 31 अक्टूबर, 1972

का. आ. 3985.—श्री एम. एम. के. वाली की, जो भारतीय प्रशासनिक सेवा राजस्थान काडर के अधिकारी और राष्ट्रीय सह-

कारिता विकास निगम, नई दिल्ली के सचिव थे, ग्रामीण विद्युत्तन निगम लिमिटेड के प्रबन्ध निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त होने पर, 30 सितम्बर, 1972 के अपराह्न से उनकी संवाएँ सिचाई और बिजली मंत्रालय को सौंपी जाती हैं।

[सं. एल-12013/6/71 एम डब्ल्यू एस.]

ए. दास, संयुक्त सचिव।

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 22nd November, 1972

S.O. 3986.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Air Corporations Act, 1953 (27 of 1953) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri G. C. Katoch, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) as a Director on the Boards of Air-India and Indian Airlines with immediate effect and until further orders.

[No. AV18013/3/71-AC.]

N. KHOSLA, Jt. Secy.

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 22 नवम्बर, 1972

का. आ. 3986.—वायु निगम अधिनियम, 1953 (1953 का 27वाँ) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा वित्त मंत्रालय (व्यय विभाग) के संयुक्त सचिव, श्री जी. सी. कटोच को तत्काल एवं अगले आवृत्तों तक एयर इण्डिया तथा इण्डियन एयरलाइन्स के निदेशक मंडलों के एक निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. ए-वी-18013/3/71-ए. सी.]

नवजीवन खोसला, संयुक्त सचिव।

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1972

S.O. 3987.—WHEREAS the Commissioner for the port of Calcutta have reported that it is necessary to raise the sum of rupees one crore being the estimated cost of construction and repair of Works and erections necessary or expedient for carrying out the purposes of the Calcutta Port Act, 1890 (Bengal Act 3 of 1890);

AND WHEREAS the Central Government is satisfied that it is necessary to raise money for the purpose;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred under section 18 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby accords sanction to the Commissioners to raise loan by issue of debentures to the extent of rupees one crore on 1st December, 1972, the repayable date being the 1st December, 1984.

[No. 9-PGA(113)/72.]

Smt. B. NIRMAL, Under Secy.

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय
(परिवहन स्कन्ध)

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1972

का.आ. 3987.—यतः कलकत्ता पोर्टन के आयुक्तों ने रिपोर्ट की है कि कलकत्ता पोर्टन अधिनियम, 1890 (1890 का बंगाल अधिनियम 3) के प्रयोजनों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए आवश्यक या समीचीन सौकर्मों और परिनिमित्तियों के सम्निर्माण और मरम्मत की प्राक्कीलत लागत के रूप में एक करोड़ रुपये की राशि संग्रह करना आवश्यक है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस प्रयोजन के लिये यह धनराशि संग्रह करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 18 के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार आयुक्तों को, एक दिसम्बर, 1972 को एक करोड़ रुपये तक के डिबेन्चर जारी करके,

जिनके प्रतिदाय की तारीख एक दिसम्बर, 1984 होगी, उधार लेने के लिए एतद्द्वारा मंजूरी देती है।

[सं. 9-पी. जी. ए. (113)/72.]

श्रीमति बी. निर्मल, अवर सचिव।

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING

New Delhi- the 16th November, 1972

ORDER

S. O. 3988—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provision of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule to the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 3792 dated the 2nd December, 1966, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Schedule.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the applicant	Name of the producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news and current events or a documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	I.N.R. No. 1254	198.73 Metres	Films Division, Government of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	..	Film dealing with News and current events.
2.	I.N.R. No. 1255	206.35 Metres	Do.	..	Do.
3.	Festival with A Difference.	450.46 Metres	Shri M. Raju, Assistant Media Officer, Department of Family Planning, Ministry of Health and Family Planning, New Delhi.	..	Film intended for educational purposes.
4.	Azadi Pachees Baras Ki	271.00 Metres	Miss Vimla 11, Ram Shyam Nivas, Sitla Devi Temple Road, Mahim-16.	..	Film intended for educational purposes.

[F. No. 28/1/72-F(P)-App 1735]

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 16 नवम्बर, 1972

घादेश

का० भा० 3988—सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के घादेश संख्या एस० प्रो० 3792, तारीख 2 दिसम्बर, 1966 की प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियमों के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किए गए निदेशों के अनुसार, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद, एतद्द्वारा इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्मों को उनके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं के रूपान्तरों सहित, जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के सामने उक्त सूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है।

13 G of I/72-4

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई 35 मि० मी०	घाबेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या फिल्म है या शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म है, या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या डाकुमैन्ट्री फिल्म है
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	भारतीय समाज और समीक्षा सं० 1254	198.73 मीटर	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई-26.	..	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म।

1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	भारतीय समाचार								निर्माण विभाग,		
	समीक्षा सं० 1255	206.35	—तृतीय—	—तृतीय—					नई दिल्ली।		
		मीटर				4.	पन्नीस वर्ष की	271.00	कुमारी विमला	शिक्षा सम्बन्धी	
3.	फैस्टीवल विद ए	450.46	श्री एम. राजू,	शिक्षा सम्बन्धी			आजादी		रामश्याम निवास		
	डिफरेंस	मीटर	सहायक सीनियर						शीतला देवी,		
			आफीसर, परिवार						महोम-16.		

[फा० संख्या 28/1/72-एफ० पी० परिशिष्ट 1735]

ORDER

S. O. 3989—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provisions of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE

- (1) Sub-Section (4) of the Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
 (2) Sub-Section (3) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulations) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act XI of 1953).

THE SECOND SCHEDULE

S. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news & Current events or a documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Maharashtra News No. 245.	295.00 Metres	Director of Publicity, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay.		Film dealing with news and current events (For release in Maharashtra Circuit only).

[F. No. 28/1/72-FP App. 1734]

फा० सं० 3988—इसके साथ लगी प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किए गये विदेशों के अनुसार, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई, की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद, एतद्वारा, इसके साथ लगी द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्म को उसके सभी भाषाओं के रूपान्तरों सहित, जिनका विवरण उसके सामने उक्त द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है :—

प्रथम अनुसूची

- (1) चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) वां केन्द्रीय (अधिनियम) की धारा 12 की उपधारा (4) तथा धारा 16.
 (2) बम्बई सिनेमा (बिनिम) अधिनियम 1953 (1953 का 11वां) बम्बई अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (3) तथा धारा 9।

द्वितीय अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई 35 मि० मि०	प्रावेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या आकस्मिक फिल्म है।
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 245.	295.00 मीटर	प्रचार, निवेशक, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, बम्बई।	“समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म (केवल महाराष्ट्र सर्किट के लिये)।	

[फा० संख्या 28/1/72-एफ० पी०-परिशिष्ट 1734]

ORDER

S.O. 3990—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provision of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule to the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 3792 dated the 2nd December, 1966, the Central Government after considering the recommendation of the Film Advisory Board Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Schedule.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news and current events or a documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	I.N.R. No. 1254 (Southern Edition).	288.47 Metres	Films Division, Government of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		Film dealing with news and current events. For release in Southern States i.e., Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Mysore and Tamil Nadu.

[F. No. 28/1/72-FP App. 1732]

का० आ० 3998—भारत सरकार के सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के आदेश संख्या एस० आ० 3792, तारीख 2 दिसम्बर, 1966 की प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियमनों के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किए गए निदेशों के अनुसार, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद, एतद्वारा, इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्म को उसके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं के रूपान्तरों सहित जिसका विवरण उसके सामने उक्त सूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	सम्बाई 35 मि० मी०	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा सम्बन्धी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घट-
-------------	--------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------	---

नामों की फिल्म है या डाकुमैन्ट्री फिल्म है।

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	भारतीय समाचार, समीक्षा संख्या 1254 (दक्षिणी संस्करण)	288.47 मीटर	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26.	..	समाचार और सामयिक घट-नामों की फिल्म (केवल दक्षिणी प्रान्तों) आन्ध्र प्रदेश, केरल मैसूर, तमिल नाडू में प्रदर्शित करने, के लिए)।

[का० सं० 28/1/72-एफ०पी० परिशिष्ट 1732]

ORDER

S.O. 3990—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provision of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule to the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 3792 dated the 2nd December, 1966, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Schedule.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news and current events or a documentary film.
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	I.N.R. No. 1255 (Western Edition)	273.71 Metres	Films Division, Government of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	..	Film dealing with news and current events. (For release in Western States, i.e. Gujarat, Maharashtra & Goa, Daman & Diu).

[F. No. 28/1/72-FP App. 1733]
HARJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

का० आ० 3991:—भारत सरकार के सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के आदेश संख्या एस० आ० 3792, तारीख 2 दिसम्बर, 1966 की प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियमनों के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किए गए निदेशों के अनुसार, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद, एतद्वारा इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्म को उसके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं के रूपान्तर सहित जिसका विवरण उसके सामने उक्त सूची कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है स्वीकृत करती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	सम्बाई 35 मि० मी०	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा सम्बन्धी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घट-
-------------	--------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------	---

नामों की फिल्म है या डाकुमैन्ट्री फिल्म है।

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1255 (पश्चिमी संस्करण)	273.71 मीटर	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24 पैडर-रोड, बम्बई-26.	..	समाचार और सामयिक घट-नामों की फिल्म (केवल गुजरात, महाराष्ट्र तथा गोवा, दमन और दीव में प्रदर्शित करने के लिए)।

[का० संख्या 28/1/72 एफ० पी० परिशिष्ट 1733]
हरजीत सिंह, अधीन सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour & Employment)

New Delhi, the 9th November, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 3992.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bank of Rajasthan Limited and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Updesh Narain Mathur shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Bank of Rajasthan Limited, Jaipur in denying Head Clerk's Allowance to Shri Babulal Choudhury with effect from the 27th December, 1971 is justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. L-12012/114/72-LR.III]

भारत और पुनर्वास मन्त्रालय

(भारत और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 नवम्बर, 1972

आदेश

क्रा० भा० 3992—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इनसे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में बैंक आफ राजस्थान लिमिटेड से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को व्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पोठासीन अधिकारी श्री उपदेश नारायण माथुर होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय जयपुर होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को व्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या बैंक आफ राजस्थान लिमिटेड, जयपुर के प्रबंधन की, श्री बाबू लाल चौधरी को 27 दिसम्बर, 1971 से प्रधान लिपिक भत्ता देने से इन्कार करने की कार्यवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं है तो वह किस अनुसूची का हकदार है।
[मं० एल० 12012/114/72 एल भा० iii]

करनैल सिंह, सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th November, 1972

CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 3993.—In the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) S.O. No. 2100 dated the 22nd April, 1972 published on page 3036 of the Gazette of

India, Part-II, Section 3 Sub-section (ii), dated the 5th August, 1972, in first line of serial No. 2 of the Schedule for "1st July, 1971" read "21st December, 1971".

[No. L/20012/19/72-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1972.

S.O. 3994.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Disergarh Office of Messrs. Equitable Coal Company Limited. Post Office Disergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th November, 1972.

AWARD

[No. L-19012/134/71-LR.II.]

KARNAIL SINGH, Under Secy.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

REFERENCE NO. 119 OF 1971

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Disergarh Office of Messrs. Equitable Coal Company Limited,

AND

Their Workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi—Presiding Officer.
Appearances:
On behalf of
Employers.

Sri Monoj Kr. Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of
Workmen.

Absent

State : West Bengal.

Industry : Coal Mine.

AWARD

By Order No. L/1912/134/71-LR.II, dated 25th November, 1971, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Disergarh Office of Messrs. Equitable Coal Company Limited and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, namely:—

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs. Equitable Coal Company Limited, Post Office Disergarh, District Burdwan, in dismissing Sri Dahari Routh, Guard, Disergarh Office, with effect from the 31st July, 1971, is justified? If not, to what relief is the workmen entitled?"

2. Notices were issued to the management and to the Union, i.e., The General Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Congress, Goral Mansion, G.T. Road, P.O. Asansol, Distt. Burdwan. The union representing the workman filed its statement of case on 30th December, 1971. The management filed its statement of case showing cause of delay on 20th May 1972. The case was fixed for positive hearing on 14th November, 1972. On the date of hearing, i.e., today, the management was present through its learned Advocate Mr. Mukherjee but the union, in spite of notice of the date fixed, did not turn up to represent the workman. So the adjudication went on *ex-parte*.

3. The learned Advocate appearing for the management raised a preliminary objection as to the entertainability of the reference and the jurisdiction of the tribunal to adjudicate upon the reference. In its statement of case filed by the workmen it will nowhere be found that regarding the subject-matter of the reference i.e., the dismissal of the workman concerned either the workman himself or the union sponsoring the cause of the workman raised any demand before any authority of the management that could either grant the relief on such demand or could reject it. In paragraph 7 of the statement of case filed by the Union it is stated that against the order of transfer transferring the workman to Bhaladih Sand Line Establishment the General Secretary of the sponsoring union raised an objection to such transfer. Which is the sponsoring union is not stated in the statement of case. In paragraph 14 of the statement of case it is stated that the workman through the Union once represented his case before the employers regarding the order of transfer of the workman from Management's colliery to Bhaladih Sand Line Establishment. It is further stated that instead of considering the said representation against the transfer order made by the union the company dismissed the workman from service with effect from 31st July, 1971. Regarding the subject-matter of the reference i.e., the dismissal of the workman from the service of the management it is nowhere stated that the union sponsoring the cause of the workman had approached any authority of the management with the demand relating to the dispute under reference that relates to the dismissal of the workman concerned. The management in paragraph 2 of its statement of case asserts, "that no demand in respect of the subject-matter of the Reference having been raised with the employer before referring the same to the conciliatory machinery, the Reference is bad in law." The management filed its statement of case on 20th May 1972 with a copy to the Union that had filed its statement of case on 30th December, 1971. No rejoinder to the managements statement of case was filed by the union representing the workman in this proceeding. So, the statement of the management in paragraph 2 of its statement of case already quoted stands uncontroverted.

4. In view of the principles laid down in the decisions reported in the case of Raju's Cafe, Coimbatore and others v.s. Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore and another, 1951 I L.J. p. 219, (decided by Madras High Court), in the case of Sindhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd. and Industrial Tribunal Gujarat & Ors., 1968 I L.J. p. 834, decided by the Supreme Court and in the case of Fedders Lloyd Corporation Private Ltd. and Lt. Governor, Delhi & Qrs., reported in F.I.R. 1970 (20) p. 343, decided by the Delhi High Court, there has been no industrial dispute as understood in law relating to the subject-matter of the reference. The workman through its union was required to lodge a charter of demand with the authority of the management that can either grant or refuse the relief demanded. If the authority of the management with whom the demand is lodged refuses to extend the relief asked for, then the demand may be lodged before the Conciliatory authority. If the conciliatory authority fails to induce the parties to come to a settlement and gives a failure report in that respect the appropriate Government, in this case the Central Government, may refer the dispute for adjudication either by the Tribunal or by the Labour Court, as the case may be. The pre-condition of an industrial dispute that can be referred for adjudication either by the Tribunal or by the Labour Court, as the case may be, is that the workman or workmen or the union representing the cause of the workmen must first lodge a charter of demand with the authority of the management that can either grant or refuse the relief demanded. If this step is not taken and the Union representing the cause of the workman, or workmen approach the Conciliatory authority with the demand relating to the dispute under reference, there is violation of the principles laid down in the decisions quoted above and the dispute referred to for adjudication by the Government to the Tribunal, as in this case, does not become an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act as explained and expounded by the decisions quoted above. Such being the position in this case, the reference of the dispute for adjudication is incompetent in law and this tribunal can neither entertain nor adjudicate upon the reference as made.

5. In the result the reference is rejected.

This is my award.

Dated, November 14, 1972.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer

New Delhi, the 25th November, 1972

S.O. 3995.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad, in a petition filed under Section 33A of the Act by Shri A. Viswanadha Sharma Compounder, Main Hospital, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Kothagudem (Andhra Pradesh) against the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem (Andhra Pradesh) which was received by the Central Government on the 9th November, 1972.

AWARD

[No. 7/21/67-LRII(i)]

KARNAIL SINGH, Under Secy.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL)

AT HYDERABAD

Present :

Sri P. S. Ananth, B.Sc., B. L. Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal (Central) Hyderabad. (A.P.).

MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO. 31 OF 1972

IN

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 30 OF 1967.

Between :

Rangu Venkati, S/o Malliah, C/o Godugumondi, Qrs. No. 88, Hanumanbasthi, P. O. Bellampalli.

—PETITIONER.

AND

Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli Collieries, P. O. Bellampalli.—RESPONDENT.

Appearances :

Sri S. V. R. S. Somayajulu, Vice President, Singareni Colliery Labour Union, for Petitioner.

Sri M. Shyam Moha, Personnel Officer, S.C. Co. Ltd., for Respondent.

AWARD

This is a petition filed under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) for setting aside the order of termination and for directing the respondent to reinstate the petitioner into service with back wages.

2. The contentions of the petitioner in his petition in short are these:—The petitioner was working as Store Mazdoor in the Sub-Stores at Bellampalli. He was aged 43 years as on 16-9-1957. This age of the petitioner was admitted by the respondent and the same was duly incorporated in the column for "age" in the identity card. The petitioner was aged about 56 years and few months by 7th May, 1971. The petitioner was surprised to receive the letter dated 7-5-1971 wherein it was falsely stated that the petitioner had reached the age of 60 years which is the age of superannuation. The petitioner's services were terminated with effect from 19-5-71 on the said ground whereas according to the admitted age the petitioner was aged only 56 years. The respondent is not entitled to alter and terminate the services of the petitioner illegally. By reason of this illegal order, there is a contravention of provisions of Section 33 of the said Act during the pendency of I.D. No. 30 of 1967 as the petitioner is a concerned workman. So the order may be set aside and the respondent may be directed to reinstate the petitioner with back wages.

3. The respondent is Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli and in its counter it is contended as follows:—The Petition is not maintainable under Section 33A

of the said Act as had been properly retired from service. The age of the petitioner from the service and identity card was scrutinised and the age was recorded as 38 years on 19-5-1949. So the petitioner attained the age of 60 years on 19-5-1971. The petitioner had been rightly retired from the service. He has no right to seek any remedy as a retired workman is not a workman discharged or dismissed under Section 33(2)(b) of the said Act. There is no contravention of Section 33 and a retired man has no cause to complain under any of the sections of the said Act. The remedy sought by the petitioner is outside the jurisdiction of this Tribunal as it is not termination under the Standing Order and as he was retired as per the Age Retirement Rules.

4. The point that arises for determination is whether the order of the respondent retiring the petitioner from service is liable to be set aside?

5. The petitioner was working as a Store Mazdoor in the Sub-Stores of the respondent at Bellampalli. He was retired from service by the respondent by issuing the order the original of Ex. R4 dated 7-5-1971 on the ground that the respondent would be attaining the age of 60 years by 19-5-1971. This order had been passed by the respondent relying on the age as mentioned in the service card which was confirmed by the Doctor R.W.I. According to the petitioner in the Identity Card Ex. P1 the age had been given as 43 years as on 16-9-1957 and so he did not attain the age of 60 years by May 1971 and so the order retiring him from service is liable to be set aside.

6. Before going into the merits of the case the objection raised by the respondent as regards the maintainability of the application under Section 33-A may be considered. It is contended by the petitioner's representative that in the petition it was not specifically mentioned whether the alleged complaint was under Section 33(1)(a) or 33(2)(b) of the said Act and so in the counter both aspects were mentioned and that it is only in the course of the arguments that the petitioner's counsel represented that the petitioner has made it clear that there was violation of provisions of Section 33(1)(a) of the said Act and that even then Section 33-A is not applicable to the present case. There is Industrial Dispute No. 30 of 1967, pending before this Tribunal and the reference which is the subject matter of I.D. No. 30 of 1967 is as follows:—

"Subject to the views expressed and recommendations made by the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry and the agreement between the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited and their Trade Unions referred to, in paragraphs 3 to 6 of Chapter IX of the Wage Board's report, what further modifications and changes in the categorisations and wage structure recommended by the said Wage Board for West Bengal and Bihar Coal Fields are necessary to make the said categorisation and wage structure applicable to the workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited having regard to the special conditions obtaining in the Andhra Pradesh Coal fields.

So as per this reference it has to be seen what further modifications and changes in the categorisation and wage structure recommended by the Wage Board for West Bengal and Bihar Coal fields are necessary to make the said categorisation and wage structure applicable to the workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited having regard to the special conditions obtaining in the Andhra Pradesh Coal Fields. Since the petitioner was also a workman under the respondent at the time when the above said reference was made he is a workman concerned in the dispute which is the subject matter of the I.D. No. 30 of 1967. It is now contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that if any benefits are given in I.D. No. 30 of 1967 the petitioner would also be benefitted till he attains the age of 60 years and that in view of the present order retiring the petitioner prematurely the petitioner is deprived of those benefits and that the present order had interfered with the service conditions of the petitioner because the service conditions of the petitioner are reduced and he is forced to retire prematurely, though he did not actually complete 60 years of age by May 1971 and so it is a contravention under Section 33(1)(a) of the said Act and so the petition under Section 33-A is maintainable.

7. The respondent's representative on the other hand contended that altering of service condition so far as the subject matter of the industrial disputes is concerned can only be with reference to the wages and that in this case there is no question of altering of wages or conditions of service since it is purely a case of a person retiring after attaining the age of superannuation, that superannuation is not connected with the dispute which relates only to wages and that if the petitioner is aggrieved he should only ask for a reference under Section 10 of the said Act but petition under Section 33-A does not lie. He relied upon the decision reported in LORD KRISHNA TEXTILE MILLS v. ITS WORKMEN [1961(1)LLJ, page 211 (Supreme Court)] wherein their Lordships while referring to Section 33(1) of the said Act observed that under Section 33(1) if an employer wants to change the conditions of service in regard to a matter connected with a pending dispute he can do so only with the express permission in writing of the appropriate authority. So the contention of the respondent's representative is that in this case superannuation is not connected with the dispute that is pending in I.D. No. 30 of 1967 and so there is no question of any conditions of service being attend during the pendency of I.D. No. 30 of 1967 under Section 33(1)(a) and so the petition under Section 33-A is not maintainable. He also contended that if the grievance of the petitioner is that he had been prematurely retired he should only get the reference made under Section 10 of the said Act but that he cannot file any petition under Section 33-A of the said Act. He also relied upon the decision reported in INDIA CL. NAVIGATION & BY. CO. V. B. CHAKRABORTY [1959 (II) LLJ, page 242 (Supreme Court)]. In that case one of the Standing Orders dealt with the question of retirement and it provided that the workmen employed by the appellant therein shall retire from the service of the appellant on reaching the stipulated age or on completion of stipulated number of years of service whichever comes first in accordance with the agreement to be entered into by the appellant and the recognised registered Trade Union. After this Standing Order was certified some correspondence passed between the parties and it was agreed that the workmen should retire on completion of 37 years of service or on reaching 60 years of age whichever comes first. Thereafter this rule was enforced by the appellant therein and some of the workmen were retired. When the respondent in that case was told that he would be retired on the ground of reaching the age of 60 years, this order was challenged by the respondent therein which was ultimately referred to the Tribunal. The question referred to the Tribunal was whether the Company had forceably retired the respondent before the age of superannuation. Now relying on this decision it is contended by the respondent's representative, that it is only a reference under Section 10 that can be made under the circumstances of this case and that the petitioner is not entitled to file a petition under Section 33-A of the said Act. He also relied upon the decision reported in MOHINI SUGAR MILLS, LTD. v. HASAN (A) [1962 (II) LLJ, page 389]. In that case one of the rules related to the age and the age of 55 years had been fixed being the age of superannuation of an employee. Under that rule respondents 2 to 9 therein were made to retire on their completing the age of 55 years. When a dispute was raised as regards the order of retirement this matter was referred to the Tribunal for adjudication. In that case there was another reference pending. The Tribunal took the view that, as there was no provision with regard to age of superannuation in the certified Standing Orders of the Company, the rule in the rules prescribing the age of superannuation would be in violation of the provisions of Standing Order and the Tribunal also took the view that the order of retirement passed during the pendency of the adjudication in the other reference without seeking approval of the Tribunal was contravention of the provisions of the Section 33 of the said Act. Their Lordships observed that even if it be assumed that the rules of the managing agents were not applicable to the employees of the Company, the award in question was not legally valid in as much as the complaint made under Section 33-A of the said Act was not at all maintainable. Their Lordships also referred to a passage in 1961 (1) LLJ, page 211 and observed that, it is therefore, manifest that the order of retirement did not require the approval of the Industrial Tribunal. Their Lordships agreed with the contention of the petitioner therein that the order of retirement did not amount to alteration of conditions of service applicable to the workmen concerned immediately before the commencement of the proceedings

in respect of an Industrial Dispute and as such it did not violate the provisions of Section 33(2). It was also contended before their Lordships that as there was no Standing Order of the Company about the age of superannuation, there could be no question of alteration of those conditions of service by fixing superannuation in accordance with the Standing Orders and this contention was also upheld by their Lordships.

8. So far as the Standing Orders in this case are concerned they do not mention anything about the age of retirement. As contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner in that case there was a Standing Order which provided for retirement and subsequently there was also some correspondence between the parties and that they had finally come to an agreement that if a workman completes the age of 60 years or puts in 37 years of service he may be retired. Now it is in evidence that there is I.D. No. 30 of 1967 pending and that if any award is passed in favour of the workmen the petitioner also would be benefited. Now it has to be seen whether in this case the order retiring the petitioner from service can be said to alter to the prejudice of the petitioner concerned in such dispute the conditions of service applicable to him in regard to any matter connected with the dispute. No doubt as laid down in 1962(2) LLJ, page 389 the retirement does not amount to discharge or punishment but it has to be seen whether an order prematurely retiring a workman can be said to be in violation of the provisions of Section 33(1)(a), since it is now the definite case of the petitioner that the respondent has violated the provisions of Section 33(1)(a) and since it is not the case of the petitioner that his case falls under Section 33(2) of the said Act. If this is a case where Section 33(2) applied then as laid down in 1962-(2) LLJ, page 389 the order of retirement does not amount to discharge or punishment and so the workmen cannot invoke section 33(2) for filing the petition under Section 33-A. As contended by the representative for the petitioner, if an order of retirement had been passed on a workman who has completed 60 years of age then the workmen cannot invoke section 33(1)(a) and file petition under Section 33A of the said Act. But this is a case where according to the Petitioner this conditions of service had been affected because the order of premature retirement was passed since the petitioner is a workman concerned in the dispute in I.D. No. 30 of 1967 and since the complaint is that he had been prematurely retired without the express permission of this Tribunal, it is in the violation of the provisions of Section 33(1)(a) and so the petition under Section 33-A is maintainable. In this view of the matter I hold that the petition is maintainable under Section 33-A of the said Act and that the petitioner need not ask for reference being made to this Tribunal under Section 10(1)(d) of the said Act.

9. Coming to the merits of the case the petitioner relies on Ex. P1 which is the identity card issued to him for the purpose of claiming quarterly bonus. As per Ex. P1 the petitioner's age was 43 years as on 16-9-1957 and so in due course he would be completing his 60th year only on 15-9-1974 but the respondent relying on the identity and service card the original of Ex. R2 and the opinion of P.W.1 Ex. R1(a) the order of retirement the original of Ex. R4 was passed to take effect from 19-5-1971.

10. Now it is in evidence that at the time when R.W.1 examined the petitioner pursuant to the requisition Ex. R.1, Ex. P1 was not produced before him. No doubt P.W.1 says that he would not depend solely on Ex. R1 if it was produced before him because he would make physical examination of the worker who is sent to him. At the same time he admits that it is possible that one or two years this side or that side of the age fixed may be approximate error and that in this case also this approximate error may be possible but at the same time he says that in his opinion the petitioner was nearing 60 years and so he confirmed his age as 60 years. He himself admits that there is scientific process of examining bones and teeth to arrive at the age of a person but according to him he did not conduct this test as regards the petitioner and that even this scientific method would be only in case of young age but it is not possible to apply this test to the persons of advanced age. From the evidence it is seen that the respondent had issued the identity card the original of Ex. R2 on 19-5-1949 showing the age of the petitioner as 38 years and also issued the identity card Ex. R1 dated 16-9-1957 giving the age as 43 years and that R.W.1 had agreed with the age given in Ex. R2 on mere physical examination of the petitioner. His

evidence also shows that it is possible that one or two years this side or that side of the age fixed may be approximate error and that it is also quite probable that in Ex. P1 also was produced before R.W.1 he might have agreed with the age mentioned in P1 which is a later document when compared to Ex. R2. Ex. P1 is authenticated document which has come into existence after a lapse of about 8 years after the issue of the original of Ex. R4 and so the age mentioned in Ex. P1 should be taken as the correct age. If age mentioned in Ex. P1 is taken as the correct age then that the usual course the order the original Ex. R4 cannot be sustained.

11. Now it is contended by the respondent's representative that when once R.W.1 has given his opinion about the age it is not open to the petitioner to dispute the age in view of Clause 18 of the agreement the original of Ex. R3. A perusal of Clause 18 of the agreement shows that the parties had agreed that the individual employees who joined the company's service before 1960 and whose age or date of birth as entered in the service record had not been verified by the Company's medical officer after the introduction of the gratuity scheme in 1959 would be sent up by the Management for verification of age or date of birth by the Company's Medical Officer. Whenever the age or date of birth as entered in the service record is contested and that the opinion of the Medical Officer in this regard would be final. So as per this Clause after the introduction of the Gratuity Scheme in 1959 all those workmen who had joined service before 1960 and whose age had not been verified by the Company's Medical Officer after the Gratuity Scheme in 1959 should be sent up by the Management to the Medical Officer for verification wherever the age or date of birth is contested. It is only when there is contest the opinion of the Medical Officer would be final as per this clause. Admittedly the petitioner is a workman who had been appointed before 1960. So after the introduction of the Gratuity Scheme if any dispute had arisen as regards the age fixed in the service record and which age had not been verified by the Company's Medical Officer after the introduction of Gratuity Scheme, then such cases, should be referred by the Company's Medical Officer. But in this case no such steps had been taken. The evidence also shows that there was no any dispute about age until the respondent on its own accord sent the requisition Ex. R1 to R.W.1 for verifying the age of the petitioner as per the identity card the original Ex. R2. It is not known why the respondent did not refer to Ex. P1 that was issued to the petitioner as early as 16-9-1957. It is seen from Ex. R5 that after the issue of the order the original Ex. R4 the petitioner had submitted an application enclosing a copy of the age certificate produced from the Sarpanch in order to show that his age was not shown correctly by the respondent and that the respondent sent the communication Ex. R5 stating that his application had been rejected. Under the circumstances of this case, in view of Ex. P1, that was issued by the respondent duly signed by the concerned officer, the respondent ought to have followed the age given in Ex. P1 in preference to the age given in the original of Ex. R2 as Ex. P1 is a later document wherein the respondent had mentioned the age of the petitioner as 43 years. It is not open to the respondent to turn round and rely on the original of Ex. R2 and the opinion given by R.W.1. The opinion of R.W.1 cannot be acted upon in view of Ex. P1. As already stated if Ex. P1 was also produced before R.W.1 it is quite probable that R.W.1 would have come to a different conclusion. I am satisfied that, under the circumstances of this case, Clause 18 of the settlement the original of Ex. R3 cannot be relied upon by the respondent, because the circumstances under which the dispute about age should be settled are quite different as seen from Clause 18 of the settlement. No doubt it is contended by the respondent's representative that it is only a bonafide order that was passed in this case, but from the evidence now adduced it is clear that order of retirement was passed in this case prematurely quite contrary to the age admitted by the respondent in Ex. P1. So such an order cannot be sustained and it is liable to be set aside. For all the aforesaid reasons I hold this point in favour of the petitioner.

12. In the result the petition is allowed and the order of retirement passed on 7-5-1971 is set aside and the respondent is directed to reinstate the petitioner into service with effect from 19-5-1971 and the respondent also is directed to pay the back wages from 19-5-1971 till the date of reinstatement into service.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 19th day of October, 1972.

P. S. ANANTH, Presiding Officer

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE.

Witnesses Examined For Petitioner.	Witnesses Examined For Respondent
NIL.	R.W.I Dr. H. M. Jagannadha Rao.

Documents exhibited for Petitioner.

Ex. P. 1.—Identity (Bonus) Card of Rangu Venkati.

Documents exhibited for Respondent.

Ex. R. 1.—Requisition sought by the Dy. General Manager, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli 16-4-71 from the Surgeon, Bellampalli regarding the opinion about the correction of the age of Rangu Venkati.

Ex. R. 1.—(a) Opinion of the surgeon dated 27-4-71 that the age recorded in Ex. R. 1 is correct.

Ex. R. 2.—Extract from Identity and service card of Rangu Venkati.

Ex. R. 3.—Memorandum of settlement dated 17-9-69 under Sec. 12(3) of the I.D. Act arrived at between the Management, Singareni Collieries Company Limited and the Singareni Collieries Workers Union, Kothagudem and Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, Bellampalli.

Ex. R. 4.—Copy of the termination notice issued to Rangu Venkati on 7-5-1971 by the Management, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli.

Ex. R. 5.—Letter dated 7-7-1971 of the Agent, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli Division sent to Rangu Venkati that he had been retired from service with effect from 19-5-1971.

New Delhi, the 25th November, 1972

S.O. 3996.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad, in a petition filed under Section 33A of the Act by Shri Rangu Venkati, Son of Malliah, Care of Godugumondi, Quarter No. 88, Hanumanbasti, Post Office Belampalli against the management of Belampalli Collieries of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Belampalli (Andhra Pradesh) which was received by the Central Government on the 14th November, 1972.

(AWARD)

[No. 7/21/67-LRII(ii)]

KARNAIL SINGH, Under Secy.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

Present :

Sri P. S. Ananth, B.Sc., B.L., Chairman, Industrial Tribunal (C), Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO. 24 OF 1971

in

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 30 OF 1967

Between

A. Viswanadha Sarma, Compounder, Main Hospital, Singareni Collieries Company, Limited, Kothagudem.—**Petitioner.**

And

1. The Management of Singareni Collieries Company, Limited, Kothagudem.

2. K. Ramananda Chatterjee, Compounder, Yellandu Hospital, S. C. Co. Ltd., Yellandu.—**Respondents.**

Appearances:

Sri A. Lakshmana Rao, Advocate, for petitioner.

Sri M. V. Ramakrishna and Sri V. Gopala Sastry, Assistant Personnel Officers, for respondents.

AWARD

This is a petition filed under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) for directing the Management to follow clause 15 of the Standing Orders in making transfer without causing prejudice to the wages and service conditions of the petitioner.

2. The contentions of the petitioner in short are these: The petitioner is a permanent employee of the Singareni Collieries Company, Limited, Kothagudem (hereinafter referred to as the first respondent) working as Compounder at the Main Hospital Kothagudem for the past ten years. He had been enjoying 18 holidays per annum and he was also getting extra remuneration for working on such holidays in terms of the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay. He is also eligible for extra remuneration for work on play-days according to the Award made by Sri Saleem Merchant. The privileges of enjoying these holidays and of getting extra remuneration are available only to the Hospital employees at Kothagudem. The employees of the rest of the hospitals at other places are eligible only for ten holidays in a year in line with holidays of the mines and depots. The Management had issued an office order on 21st January, 1971 transferring the petitioner to Yellandu Hospital. The order reads that the petitioner would be governed by hours of work, holidays and conditions of service and customary concessions and privileges as applicable to the staff working in the department where he would be required to work on transfer from time to time. Thus the management has reduced the number of holidays applicable to the petitioner from 18 to 10 and also deprived him of their remuneration payable. The remuneration payable for work on holidays and play-days forms part of wages as defined under the Payment of Wages Act. The action of the Management in depriving holidays and remuneration for work on holidays amounts to a breach of payment of Wages Act. Besides the action of the Management being in violation of Payment of Wages Act, the transfer order is also in violation of Clause 15 of the Standing Orders which reads that all employees are liable to be transferred from one department to another or from one Section to another under the same management provided that such transfer does not cause any breach to the wages and other conditions of service. As per paragraph 2 of the Order of appointment of the petitioner his services are liable to be transferred to any of the other Collieries, and that he would be eligible for usual leave and other concessions according to rules and regulations of the company in force from time to time. As this transfer aims at depriving the petitioner of 18 holidays and the remuneration payable for work on such holidays granted in terms of

the award of the Central Government and also the remuneration payable for work on play days, the order of transfer issued is in violation of the Standing Orders. Although the petitioner was informed that he would be governed by the hours of work, holidays and conditions of service and customary concessions and privileges as applicable to the staff working in the departments, the Management on the contrary has advised another compounder Ramananda Chatterjee who is also transferred to avail only such holidays which were originally availed by him in his existing department. The procedure adopted by the Management is discriminatory besides the same being violative of the Standing Order. The petitioner is a workman concerned in I.D. No. 30 of 1967 and his conditions of service as emoluments as well as number of paid and unpaid holidays are altered to his prejudice. The order of transfer is issued in colourable exercise of power to deprive the petitioner of the conditions of service and the Management is guilty of unfair labour practice in as much as double standards are applied to the same category of workmen with a view to change the service conditions. No notice proposing change of conditions of service as contemplated under Section 9(A) of the said Act is served upon the petitioner. On the other hand notice was put up on the notice board proposing change of conditions of the petitioner as to number of holidays paid and unpaid on his transfer from Kothagudem to Yellandu. The petitioner has not handed over change at Kothagudem Hospital. So the Management may be directed to follow Clause 15 of the Standing Order in making transfer without causing prejudice to the wages and service conditions of the petitioner and also to stay the operation of the order dated 21st January, 1971, transferring him from Kothagudem Main Hospital to Yellandu Hospital.

3. The first respondent which is Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem, filed a reply statement contending as follows: It is true that the petitioner while working at Kothagudem would be entitled for certain benefits like extra holidays etc. The Management received repeated requests from Ramananda Chatterjee that he might be posted to Kothagudem in view of his Wife's health. Ramananda Chatterjee has been at Yellandu since 1961. The petitioner had been working at Kothagudem since 1961. The management wanted to transfer Chatterjee to Kothagudem on compassionate grounds and at the same time an equally experienced man was required to be posted at Yellandu. In the circumstances the Management on the representation of Chief Surgeon and Medical Officer proposed that the petitioner should be transferred to Yellandu and office order to this effect was issued on 3rd November, 1970. As the Hospital employees at Yellandu get reduced number of holidays and there are changes in the conditions of service which the petitioner was enjoying at Kothagudem Hospital, the Management was constrained to issue a notice under Section 9A of the said Act on 2nd November, 1970, specifying the intention to effect the change with effect from 25th November, 1970. Immediately the petitioner approach the Management for cancellation of the transfer order. The Andhra Pradesh Singareni Collieries Mazdoor Sangh raised a dispute on 5th November, 1970, which was conciliated upon by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Vijayawada. As the Conciliation Proceedings were pending the transfer dated 3rd November, 1970, could not be given effect to. After the failure of the conciliation, the Government of India received the failure report of the Assistant Labour Commissioner on 8.1.1971. The pendency of conciliation Proceedings concluded on 15th January, 1971. The Management by their Office Order dated 21st January, 1971, have given effect to the transfer order contained in their office order dated 3rd November, 1970. The petitioner and the Union having raised an Industrial Dispute, which is pending with the Government are estopped to file this petition under Section 33A with a view to gain time and to hinder the Management from effecting the transfer order. In the circumstances it is incorrect to state that the order of transfer is mala fide discriminative or it is an act of victimisation. That the holidays for those who work at Yellandu are less does not mean that transfer cannot take place nor does it restrict the right of the Management from transferring the employee from one place to another. It is open to the Management to change the terms and conditions of service by giving notice under Section 9(A) of the said Act in the manner prescribed therein and there is no need to serve notice as individual workman. There is no such procedure prescribed under the said Act. When once Section 9A notice is issued, it is open to the Management to change the service conditions even if there is a change

in this case. There is no vested right on the part of the employee to claim posting in any particular place. This is nothing but an interference with the managerial function of the management. The petitioner received the transfer order on 23rd January, 1971. As Chatterjee was on authorised leave during that period, one Sastry was temporarily posted there and the petitioner could not be relieved immediately to take charge from Sastry who was sent to Yellandu only to look after the work temporarily during the authorised absence of Chatterjee. The petitioner himself obtained leave from 27th January, 1971, to 30th January, 1971 on the plea that he would be going to his native place Vijayawada. But he had chosen to come to Hyderabad and file the present petition. This Tribunal has given an order in M.P. No. 24 of 1971. It may be mentioned that by the time the order was passed on 29th January, 1971, the petitioner was already in possession of the order passed by this Tribunal in M.P. No. 24 of 1971 had become infructuous. The application filed in M.P. No. 24 of 1970 is misconceived and without jurisdiction. The question of issuing stay order or order of injunction does not arise. This Tribunal can only pass an order after hearing the parties and pass either a part award or a whole award.

4. During the pendency of M.P. No. 24 of 1971 the petitioner filed M.P. No. 42 of 1971 for adding the second respondent as party, since the second respondent had been transferred from Yellandu to Kothagudem in the place of the petitioner and the same was allowed on 29th January, 1972. Even though notice was issued to the second respondent to file his counter, if any, he did not choose to file any counter.

5. Now the point that arises for determination is whether the first respondent should be directed not to cause any prejudice as regards the wages and service conditions of the petitioner on his transfer to Yellandu?

6. The relevant facts may be stated as gathered from the evidence on record in this case. The petitioner was appointed as Compounder in the Medical Department and he was asked to report for duty to the Chief Surgeon and Medical Officer, Kothagudem Collieries. Ex. R. 1 is the copy of that office order dated 14th October, 1961. Even since his appointment as Compounder he was working in the hospital at Kothagudem. According to the first respondent the second respondent, who had been working as Compounder in the Hospital at Yellandu since 1961, requested for transfer to Kothagudem in view of his Wife's health and so the Management decided to transfer him to Kothagudem on compassionate grounds and so the petitioner was transferred to the Hospital at Yellandu. It is in evidence that so far as the Hospital at Kothagudem is concerned the employees in that Hospital are enjoying 18 holidays that out of these 18 holidays 7 are paid holidays and that so far as the remaining 11 holidays are concerned if a person is asked to work on those holidays he used to get one extra muster if he worked for 8 hours. Ex. P. 3 is the copy of the circular issued by the Medical Department of the first respondent which mentions about 18 holidays. There is also an award passed in this connection and Ex. P. 2 is copy of that award. So far as the Hospital at Yellandu is concerned the employees there are not enjoying holidays for 18 days. Treating the enjoyment of this extra holidays by the petitioner as a condition of service, the respondent issued notice under Section 9A of the said Act stating that consequent upon the transfer of the petitioner to Yellandu at in order to maintain uniform privileges to the workmen at Yellandu Hospital the Management had to issue that notice for terminating the privileges that were being enjoyed by the petitioner at Kothagudem and also stating that the petitioner would be governed by the privileges and the customary concession enjoyed by the other workmen at Yellandu Hospital on transfer. This notice was issued on 2nd November, 1970 as seen from the copy of the notice Ex. R. 2. Ex. R. 2 shows that a copy of the notice was sent to Andhra Pradesh Singareni Collieries Mazdoor Sangh. The said Mazdoor Sangh sent the letter Ex. R. 4 dated 5th November, 1970, protesting against the issue of such a notice stating that the petitioner had been enjoying 18 days Festival holidays as per the award of the Central Government and as such the petitioner should not be disturbed from the existing place of work. The petitioner also sent his representation Ex. R. 3 dated 7th November 1970, objecting to his transfer to Yellandu. Subsequently Conciliation proceeding took place and the conciliation officer sent his report on 8th January, 1971 to the Government of India and the Government of India sent a communication Ex. R. 6 dated 13th January, 1971 intimating the Mazdoor Sangh and

the first respondent about the receipt of the report of the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Vijayawada, who is said to be the Conciliation Officer in this case. According to the first respondent the Government also sent a further communication the original of Ex. R. 5 dated 9th August, 1971 intimating the first respondent and also the Mazdoor Sangh that the Government of India did not propose to take any action in the dispute as it is not appropriate Government in relation to this dispute. It is admitted by the petitioner in his evidence that he requested the Andhra Pradesh Singareni Colliery Mazdoor Sangh to represent his case to the Management. His evidence also shows that he became a member of the Mazdoor Sangh and that at the time the Mazdoor Sangh, represented the petitioner, he was the member of that Mazdoor Sangh. After the first respondent received the letter Ex. R. 6, it issued the office order the original of Ex. P. 1 dated 21st January, 1971 transferring the petitioner to the Hospital at Yellandu in the place of the second respondent.

7. After passing the order the original of Ex. P. 1, the petitioner filed the present petition on 28th January, 1971. Alongwith the present petition, the petitioner also filed M.P. No. 25 of 1971 requesting this Tribunal to stay the operation of the order dated 21st January, 1971. My learned predecessor passed an interim order on 29th January, 1971 in M.P. No. 25 of 1971 ordering that *status quo* should be maintained till the disposal of that petition and notice was issued to the first respondent and subsequently he passed a final order on that petition on 25th February, 1971, modifying the order passed on 29th January, 1971 observing that the transfer of the petitioner to Yellandu Hospital shall take effect without prejudice to the petitioners conditions of service which he was enjoying at Kothagudem. Subsequent to this order the petitioner appears to have joined the Hospital at Yellandu.

8. It is now seen that in I.D. No. 30 of 1967, which is pending before this Tribunal, the petitioner is also interested since the compounders have claimed a particular grade. So the petitioner filed the present petition in I.D. No. 30 of 1967 on the ground that his transfer to Yellandu had changed his service conditions and that it is in violation of the provisions of Section 33 of the said Act. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petition is maintainable under Section 33A of the said Act since the service conditions of the petitioner are sought to be changed in violation of Section 33 of the said Act. He relied upon the decision reported in *STANDARD VACUUM OIL COMPANY LTD., CALCUTTA v. THEIR EMPLOYEES 1954 (II) LLJ, page 355*. It is now seen that the first respondent had issued a notice under Section 9A of the said Act with reference to this transfer treating the enjoyment of the extra holidays by the petitioner as a condition of service. So there cannot be any serious objection so far as the maintainability of the present petition under Section 33A of the said Act is concerned if once it is found that the petitioner is a workman concerned in I.D. No. 30 of 1967.

9. Now one of the contentions of the first respondent is that so far as I.D. No. 30 of 1967 is concerned it is only a reference made by the Central Government as regards the workers in the Mines, whereas the petitioner is working in a hospital and that as hospital is not part of the Mines the Central Government has no jurisdiction to make any reference so far as the employees working in the hospitals are concerned and so the petitioner cannot be said to be a person concerned in I.D. No. 30 of 1967 and so the petition under Section 33A of the said Act is not maintainable. He also contended that in a case of *Stenographer* when the Central Government made a reference to this Tribunal and an award was passed by this Tribunal, the reference itself was held to be bad in law by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh in Writ Appeal No. 4 of 1970 (a copy of the judgment in Writ Appeal 4/70 was produced before me for perusal). It is seen from the judgment in Writ Appeal 4/70 that with reference to a dispute between the Management of the Singareni Collieries and its Workman employed in the publicity section was referred to this Tribunal and that this Tribunal upheld the objection of the Management that the reference was incompetent on the ground that it is only the State Government which should have made the reference and that when a Writ Petition was filed to quash that award that writ petition was dismissed and in the writ appeal also the judgment in the writ petition was confirmed. But it is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that so far

as hospital is concerned it has been held by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh that it is a part of coal industry and so the judgment in the Writ Appeal 4/70 is not applicable to the facts of the present case. A copy of the judgment in Writ Appeal 286 of 1969 passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh was produced before me for perusal. A perusal of the judgment in the Writ Appeal shows that one of the questions that arose was whether the medical and sanitary department of Singareni Collieries Company Limited was an industry. After considering the several decisions placed before their Lordships and after considering the nature of the medical and sanitary department run by the company, their Lordships held that the employees of the company in the medical and sanitary department render such essential services to the company without which the company cannot carry on its main activity and fulfil its avowed object of production of coal for which it is formed and incorporated and which activity is undoubtedly an industry. No doubt the Medical and Sanitary Department of the company is held to be an industry but the contention of the first respondent's representative is that the reference which is a subject matter of I. D. No. 30 of 1967 is bad in law so far as it relates to the employees working in the Medical Department and so when the reference is bad in so far as this particular type of employees are concerned the petitioner is not entitled to file a petition under Section 33 A of the said Act. So far as this aspect of the matter is concerned it is not necessary to consider this aspect in the present proceedings because I. D. No. 30 of 1967 is pending where this aspect of the matter also can be considered if necessary. Now the fact remains that the reference relates to compounders also, and since it is the case of the petitioner that there has been change in his service conditions the provision of Section 33 of the said Act are contravened and so he is entitled to file the petition under Section 33 A of the said Act. As already stated the 1st respondent had also issued the notice under Section 9 A of the said act relating to the petitioner treating the privilege of enjoying extra number of holidays by the petitioner at Kothagudem as a condition of service. So the petition under Section 33 A filed by the petitioner is maintainable under the circumstances of this case.

10. So far as transfer of the petitioner to Yellandu is concerned it is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that this transfer is in violation of Standing Order 15 of the Standing Orders of the first respondent. A copy of the Standing Order of the first respondent was produced before me and Standing Order 15 is as follows :—

"All employees are liable to be transferred, from one Department to another or from one Section to another or from one Colliery to another under the same management provided such transfer does not cause any prejudice to their wages and other conditions of service."

It is contended by the first respondent's representative that this Standing Order 15 itself is not valid since the schedule to the industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act does not refer to any transfer and that any Standing Orders that are framed by a company can only be with reference to matters provided under the schedule to that Act and that when the Standing Order is invalid neither the petitioner nor the first respondent can rely on that particular Standing Order. The learned counsel for the petitioner on the other hand contended that the Standing Order is not defined in the said Act and so the Standing Order does not necessarily mean a certified Standing Order under the said Act and that when there is a Standing Order of the Company the first respondent cannot now turn round and say that the particular Standing Order is invalid and that so long as that Standing Order is in force and till that Standing Order is set aside the parties are bound by the Standing Orders. He relied upon the decision reported in 1954 (II) LLJ, page 355. It is that case it was observed by the Labour Appellate Tribunal that in considering the question whether transfer from one place to another had effected a change in the conditions of service of a workman, it has to be seen whether there are Standing Orders or whether the conditions of service have been reduced in writing and that if there are Standing Orders if the service condition is reduced in writing, then the question

to be seen is whether the rules or provisions dealing with the matter of transfer of the fullest amplitude, that is to say, whether they cover the whole field of transfer or whether they are not so. It was also observed there that the liability to be transferred from one place to another by the employer is an implied condition of service of every employee. He also relied upon the decision reported in *AMAR DYE-CHEM. LTD., KALYAN v. G. M. RAUT & ANOTHER* (1959 (II) LLJ, page 98) wherein the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay observed that when an employer has in fact framed and applied Standing Order to his workmen the provisions of Section 33(2) of the said Act are attracted, though the Standing Order may not have been certified. So the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that as per Standing Order 15 the transfer can be effected only if it does not cause any prejudice to the wages and other conditions of service of the petitioner.

11. For the purpose of the present case in view of the fact that there is Standing Order 15, which is in force, normally both parties are bound by this particular Standing Order until this Standing Order is modified or deleted. It is also contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that even if it is assumed for a moment that the Standing Order 15 is not valid and that the parties cannot rely on this particular Standing Order, still there is an implied condition of service that transfer should not cause any prejudice to the wages and other conditions of service and that now by transfer of the petitioner to Yellandu he is losing the benefit of enjoying extra holidays, which are available at Kothagudem. Ex. P2 is the copy of the award dated 18-6-1972 passed by Sri Saleem M. Merchant with reference to the workmen of the Medical and Sanitary Department employed at Kothagudem. A perusal of it shows that so far as 11 extra holidays are concerned in case the monthly paid workmen are asked to work on those holidays they would be paid one extra wage. Now no doubt the petitioner would lose this privilege by his transfer to Yellandu since there is no such privilege granted at Yellandu but at the same time it cannot be said that the management has no power to transfer its employees. In the present case it is also seen from Ex. R. 1, which is the copy of the order of appointment issued to the petitioner, that the services of the petitioner are liable to be transferred to any of their Collieries and that the petitioner would be eligible for the usual leave and other concessions in accordance with the rules and regulations of the company in force from time to time. Now the only ground on which this transfer is attracted is that by this transfer the petitioner is losing certain privileges enjoyed by him at Kothagudem.

12. So far as some of the privileges enjoyed by the employees are concerned, if they amount to conditions of service, then the employer has always the right to effect change in the service conditions by issuing a notice under Section 9A of the said Act. That is what that had exactly taken place in the present case. No doubt it is also contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that in this case no proper notice had been issued under Section 9A of the said Act and that there has been no personal service of the notice on the petitioner. But as rightly contended by the first respondent's representative it is nowhere provided in the rules that such notice should be served personally on the workmen. Under Rule 34 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules any employer intending to effect any change in the conditions of service applicable to any workmen in respect of any matter specified in the 4th Schedule to the said Act shall give notice of such intention in form E and that that notice shall be displayed conspicuously by the employer on a notice board at the main entrance of the establishment and in the Manager's office. In the present case it is seen from Ex. R. 2 that the first respondent had issued that notice and that a copy of it had been sent to the General Secretary of the Mazdoor Sangh who also issued his reply Ex. R. 2. to that notice on behalf of the petitioner. As already stated the petitioner himself has admitted that he was a member of that Mazdoor Sangh at the crucial time. Further it is also seen that the petitioner himself had sent his objection to that notice and it is Ex. R. 3. So, under the circumstances of this case, I am satisfied that the first respondent has issued only a valid notice under Section 9A of the said Act. It is only after the issue of the notice finally, after the conciliation proceedings were over, the first respondent issued the transfer order the original of Ex. P. 1 transferring the peti-

tioner to Yellandu. So the petitioner cannot now contend that there had been violation of the provisions of Section 33 of the said Act and that he cannot be transferred to Yellandu and that even if he is transferred he should be allowed to enjoy the privileges that he was enjoying at Kothagudem and so the petition is liable to be dismissed.

13. It is also one of the contentions of the petitioner that it is because he gave evidence in I. D. No. 30 of 1967 he was transferred to Yellandu and so it is an act of victimisation. It is contended by the first respondent's representative that there is no basis for this contention of the petitioner and that when nearly 100 persons had already been examined in I. D. No. 30 of 1967, there is absolutely no reason why the management should pitch upon the petitioner for transferring him from Kothagudem and that the reason why the petitioner was transferred was due to the fact that the second respondent had requested for transfer in view of ill-health of his wife. It is now seen that several witnesses were examined in I. D. No. 30 of 1967. So it is not a case where the petitioner alone gave evidence in I. D. No. 30 of 1967. I am satisfied that it is just for the purpose of this petition that the petitioner has come forth with an allegation that because he had deposed in I. D. No. 30 of 1967 he was transferred. When it is seen that several persons had given evidence in I. D. No. 30 of 1967 it does not stand to reason why the management should pitch upon only the petitioner and transfer him. I am satisfied that the transfer of the petitioner is not by way of any victimisation.

14. It is also contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the first respondent cannot have two different standards and that when certain privileges are given to some of the workmen at Kothagudem the same privileges should be given to the workmen at Yellandu and other places and that it is only a case of discrimination. No doubt there is some force in this contention but so far as this Tribunal is concerned it cannot go into this aspect of the matter. It is always left to the concerned workmen to approach the Management either by themselves or through their Unions to redress such grievances. It is also a case of the petitioner that when the second respondent was transferred to Kothagudem it was made clear in the order of transfer that he would be entitled only to the privileges that he was enjoying at Yellandu, whereas when the petitioner was transferred he was not shown any such concession but now it is represented by the first respondent's representative that though originally such an order was issued, so far as the second respondent is concerned finding that it was only a wrong order that was issued a subsequent order was issued modifying the earlier order under which the second respondent is entitled to the same privileges enjoyed by the same type of workmen at Kothagudem. So in view of this representation it is not necessary to consider about this aspect of the matter further.

15. For all the aforesaid reasons I hold on this point that the first respondent cannot be directed not to cause any prejudice as regards the wages and the service conditions of the petitioner on his transfer to Yellandu.

16. Inasmuch as I have held that the first respondent cannot be directed not to cause any prejudice as regards the wages and the service conditions of the petitioner on his transfer to Yellandu, the petition is liable to be dismissed and so the petition is dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 22nd day of September, 1972.

P. S. ANANTH, Presiding Officer

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

Witnesses examined for
petitioner :

Witnesses examined for
respondent :

P. W. 1.—A. Viswanadha Sarma.

Nil.

DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR PETITIONER

Ex. P. 1.—Transfer orders of A. Viswanadha Sarma dt. 21-7-1972 issued by the M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Kothagudem.

Ex. P. 2.—Award of Salim Merchant Central Industrial Tribunal, Bombay dt. 16-6-62 in reference N. C. G. 17-28 of 1961 of S. C. Co. Ltd.,

Ex. P. 3.—List of holidays dt. 8-8-1962 for Hospital of S. C. Co. Ltd., Kothagudem.

DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR RESPONDENT

Ex. R. 1.—Appointment order dt. 14-10-1961 of A. Viswanadha Sarma issued by the Management of S. C. Co. Ltd., Kothagudem.

Ex. R. 2.—Notice of change of service condition issued by the management S. C. Co. Ltd., on 2-11-1970 to the concerned workmen.

Ex. R. 3.—Letter dt. 7-11-1970 of Sri A. Viswanadha Rao addressed to Regional Labour Commissioner (C) Hyderabad regarding change of service condition under Section 9 A of I. D. Act.

Ex. R. 4.—Letter dt. 5-11-1970 of the General Secretary, Mazdoor Sangh, Kothagudem, addressed to the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) Hyderabad, regarding the notice of change of service conditions.

Ex. R. 5.—Letter dt. 9-8-1970 of Under Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment, Delhi addressed to General Manager, S. C. Co. Ltd., Kothagudem and General Secretary, A. P. Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Kothagudem regarding change of service condition of A. Viswanadha Sarma.

Ex. R. 6.—Letter dt. 13-1-1971 of Section Officer, Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment, New Delhi, addressed to the General Manager, S. C. Co., Ltd., Kothagudem and the General Secretary, A. P. Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Kothagudem stating that the failure report of Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Vijayawada in respect of A. Viswanadha Sarma has received to the Ministry.

New Delhi, the 25th November, 1972

S.O. 3997.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Kothagudem Collieries (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th November, 1972.

(AWARD)

[No. 7/28/70-LRII.]

KARNAIL SINGH, Under Secy.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT
HYDERABAD (A.P.)

Present : Sri P. S. Ananth, B.Sc., B.L.,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal (Central),
Hyderabad (A. P.).

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 22 OF 1971

BETWEEN

The workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
palli.

AND

Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Belam
palli.

Appearances :

Sri B. Gangaram, Vice-President, S. C. Workers' Union,
for workmen.

Sri M. Shyam Mohan, Personnel Officer, S.C. Co. Ltd.,
Belampalli, for Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) by its Order No. 7/28/70-LR II dt. 10-2-1971 referred the following dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) for adjudication to this Tribunal, namely:

"Whether the action of the management of Kalyan Khani Workshop, Mandamari Division, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, in not granting Category VI (New) and Category V (new) to Sarvasri Gulam Ghose and Mohammad Roza, Armature Winders, respectively, as per the recommendations of the Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled and from what date?"

This reference was taken on file as Industrial Dispute No. 22 of 1971 and notices were issued to the parties. For the purpose of convenience the claimants who are workmen under the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Mandamari Division are referred to as the petitioners and the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Mandamari Division is referred to as the respondent in the course of this award.

2. The petitioners are represented by the Singareni Collieries Workers Union, Bellampalli (hereinafter referred to as the said Union) and the Vice-president of the said Union filed the claims statement contending as follows: Gulam Ghose has been working as Armature winder in old category VII from 30-11-1965. After the introduction of the new Wage Board recommendations he should have been given category VI as he is an Armature Winder with experience of 5 years. Similarly Md. Raza is working as Armature Winder since 30-11-1965. He was given old Category IV wages. After the introduction of the Wage Board recommendations he should have been given atleast Category V if not category VI. The management's refusal to give them category VI and V respectively is not justified. The Wage Board has clearly stated in volume II in Appendix V that Armature Winders with less experience should be in Category V and those with more experience should be in Category VI. On 26-10-1968 the Labour Enforcement Officer (Central) Mancherla enquired into this matter and found the petitioners actually working as Armature Winders independently. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Hyderabad by his letter dated 29-11-68, while enclosing a copy of the Labour Enforcement Officer's enquiry report addressed to the Agent observed that the enquiry report was self-explanatory and he requested the management to take action according to the findings of the Labour Enforcement Officer but the Management did not take any action on this letter. Gulam Ghose is the first man to start work winding work in Mandamari Division and he had given training in Armature winding to many I.T.I. candidates and others. He is capable of winding motors and

starters efficiently and he is having an adequate knowledge of connections etc. So he is highly skilled Armature Winder and his performance comes under the job description shown in serial No. 13 in Category VI of the Wage Board recommendations. Md. Roza also passed trade test and he is also well experienced in Armature winding. He is eligible to get category V as per the job description shown as serial No. 26 in category V. So Gulam Ghouse and Md. Roza should be given new categories VI and V respectively with effect from 15-8-1967.

3. The respondent filed a counter statement contending as follows: The schedule as per the reference for granting a higher category to the individual workman is covered by the reference in I.D. No. 30 of 1967 and so it is not justifiable pending the reference in winder terms in I.D. No. 30 of 1967. Gulam Ghouse was appointed as General Mazdoor on Category I wages with effect from 2.2.1964 and was promoted as a winder on category IV with effect from 1-5-64, and later on category VII (old) with effect from 30-11-1965. He was appropriately fixed in category V under the Wage Board recommendations and does not merit a higher category with his experience. In accordance with the tradesman agreement the strength and categories of skilled and semi-skilled workmen of Mandamari Workshop is fixed and the claimants were rightly fixed in Category VII and IV. Md. Roza was appointed as general mazdoor on Category I with effect from 19-1-1965 and was promoted as Winder on category IV from 30-11-1965. After the implementation of the Wage Board recommendations is not entitled for higher category. It is denied that they are working independently. There are master grade tradesmen and charge-hand and Assistant Engineer to supervise and guide their work from day to day. Workmen referred to have elementary experience and had no occasion to check up the work of Armature Winding and the designation attributed to them as Armature Winders both in the claims statement and reference is misleading and erroneous. When the workmen are not designated as armature winders the claim for higher category is spurious. Their category is in accordance with the agreement and it is in conformity with the practice obtaining in the collieries. A preclation on technical matters can only be arrived at by the supervisors under whom the workmen worked and not by non-technical officers like the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) and Labour Enforcement Officer (Central). The assumption by the Workers Union that the Labour Enforcement Officer (C) is an arbitrator is wrong. It is denied that Gulam Ghouse started winding work in Mandamari Division. The Circular dated 13-10-1967 issued by the Managament does not indicate any designation as Armature Winder. In other words the electrician would perform the duties of a winder. So the workmen mentioned donot come under the highly skilled category as per the job description in Serial Nos. 13 and 26 of the recommendations of the Wage Board. Further as per paragraph 10 of the minutes of discussions held on 10th and 11th February 1966; between the representatives of the Management and the workmen before the sub-committee who were members of the Wage Board in respect of artisans and craftsmen, the parties are governed by the agreement and in view of this arrangement the workers will have no claim to reopen the issue on any occusion. As the recommendations of the Wage Board are not statutory and when the Management has implemented

in good faith, any grievance made out by individual workman is without relevance to the borad issues involved like the promotion policy of the management or classification of grading by the management.

4. The dispute that is referred to this Tribunal for adjudication is whether the action of the respondent in not granting category VI (new) and Category V (new) to Gulam Ghouse and Md. Roza Armature Winders respectively as per the recommendations of the Wage Board is justified?

5. The petitioners are working in Kayan Khani Workshop of Mandamari Division of Singareni Collieries Company Limited. W.W. 1 (Gulam Ghouse) W.W. 2 (Mohammad Roza) are the petitioners in this case. According to W.W. 1 he is working as Winder, that he was placed in old category IV that after he was trade tested he was given old category VII, that he is entitled to new category VI as per the Wage Board recommendations, whereas he has been given only Category V. According to W.W. 2 he is also working as Winder, that he is working independently when a certain work is allotted to him, that as per the Wage Board recommendations he is entitled to Category V, whereas he has been placed in Category IV. The contention of the respondent is that W.W.1 and 2 had been rightly fixed in Categories V and IV respectively, that the petitioners have only elementary experience and had no occasion to check up the work of armature winding, that the designation attributed to them as Armature Winder both in the claims statemen and the reference is misleading and erroneous, that when the petitioners are no designated as Armature Winder the claim for higher category is spurious. Now it has to be seen is whether the petitioners claim can be upheld.

6. So far as W.W.1 is concerned he says that he knows all kinds of winding work, that he can do re-winding of all sorts of meters, transformers and armatures, that his superiors will give the nature of the work to be done and he will do it, that he also taught work to the I.T.I. candidates who were sent for training under him, and that he is entitled to new Category VI because his work is highly skilled and that the Wage Board has recommended Category VI for highly skilled workers. He also says that Mandamari Workshop is a new one that was started, that there is Winder designation also at Mandamari Workshop besides the designations of electrician and wiremen. He also says that his appointment order Ex. W.4 shows that he is a Winder. Ex. W.4 is the office order issued by the respondent which shows that W.W.1, who had been promoted as Winder, was confirmed as Winder in old category VII. So this also shows that there is designation of Winder in the Mandamari Division though at one stage it was argued by the respondents' representative that there is no designations as Armature Winder. When once the designation is given as Winder simply because a particular workman is not described as Armature Winder, it does not mean that there is no designation as Armature Winder at all. The evidence shows that the job of the Winder is only to attend to armature winding. Further it is seen from Ex. M.1 which is said to be work allotment register, that W.W.1 is doing winding work. Ex. M. 1(a), M.1(b), and M.1(d) are some of the entries marked in Ex. M.1 relating to W.W.1 and they show that the work of W.W.1 is only armature winding

work. W.W.3 (Ahmed Sherief) is working as Fitter and he also says that W.Ws. 1 and 2 are working as Winders.

7. W.W.2 says that he is doing winding work independently that he does winding work upto 240 horse power motors, the suggestion put to him is that he is doing only minor winding works. He has denied this suggestion. He says that he is doing the same work done by W.W. 1 that he is working only for new Category V because he is not capable of doing big work. W.W. 3 says that W.W. 1 is skilled worker, that he does big job and that W.W.2 has got less experience though both W.Ws. 1 and 2 do the same type of work. Ex. 1(c) is one of the entries in Ex. M.1 relating to W.W. 2, and it shows that he is doing the armature winding work.

8. M.W. 1 (B. Ramachander) is working as Charge-hand. He says that the allots work to the petitioners, that the work given to them is the work of re-winding the burnt motors that come for repairs, that they strip down the burnt coils, that they also do the work of re-winding of D. C. armatures, that the electricians in this company do not know the work of re-winding, that the rewinding relates to the motors of the horse power ranging from 3 H.P. to 100 H.P. According to him the work done by the petitioners is only semi-skilled work. According to him there is no designation as Armature Winders in Kothagudem and also in Bellampalli and Mandamari Divisions. He admits that the petitioners work independently. M.W.2 (Y. Adiseshaiah) is the Assistant Engineer. He says that the winders do the work of inserting the insulation into the slot and keep the new coils in the slots and give final connection as per original connections. He says that the petitioners had been doing the work of re-winding of 15 H.P. starters and other starters upto 100 H.P. on the L.T. side. He says that he cannot say whether the petitioners can do the re-winding of A.C. rotors because this sort of work never entrusted to them at any time.

9. Now from the evidence referred to it is clear that the petitioners have been doing only armature re-winding work and that out of the two petitioners W.W. 1 is more skilled than W.W. 2. In order to substantiate the respondent's contention that the petitioners had been rightly fixed in their present categories the respondent relied upon Ex. M. 2 which is said to be a copy of the minutes of discussion and item 9 in it is relied upon to show about the categorisation agreed upon as regards Fitters and Electricians. The marking of this document was objected to on the ground that it was never signed by any one. However, Ex. M.2 does not in any way help the respondent and it can be ignored. As already stated, the petitioners had been doing winding work and out of the petitioners one is more skilled than the other. It is contended by the respondent's representative that old Category IV and V have been equated to new Category IV as per the Circular issued and that so far as Category VII is concerned it is equated to new category V and so there is no basis for the present claim put forward by the petitioners. Now it is seen that as per the job description given in Appendix V in Volume 2 of the report of the Central Wage Board of the Coal Mining Industry that Armature Winder Grade I is a workman who is capable of winding motors and starters efficiently and having adequate knowledge of connections etc., and that he must be capable of working independently and that Armature Winder Grade II is a workman having some general qualifications as an Armature winder Grade I but having less skill or experience and requiring some degree of guidance and supervision. Now it is basing only on this job description that W.W. 1 is claiming new Category VI and W.W. 2 is claiming new category V. Now from the evidence it is seen that W.W. 1 is senior and skilled winder and that he had also given training to I.T.I. candidates and that W.W. 2 has got less experience when compared to W.W. 1, though W.W. 2 is also doing the same kind of job done by W.W. 1. Though it is the contention of the respondent's representative that there has been no designation as Armature winder under the respondent, I have already observed that the work done by the petitioners is only that of Armature re-winding work. Simply because in Ex. W.4 W.W. 1 is not described as Armature Winder it does not mean that he won't come under the job description given in the Appendix V already referred to. No doubt it is seen that it is elicited in the evidence of M.M. 2 that the original work of Armature Winding is not taken up by the respondent and that the original work of Armature Winding will be done only by the manufacturers, but it is nobody's case that the petitioners are doing any original work of armature winding. It is only to see that when-

ever the armatures in the motors got burnt the re-winding work is done, instead of purchasing a new armature, and it is only to do this re-winding work that workmen like the petitioners are employed by the respondent. So when the petitioners are doing the work of re-winding of the armatures certainly they come under the job description given for Armature Winder in the Wage Board recommendations. On a consideration of the evidence in this case I am satisfied that the petitioners are Armature Winders as per the job description given in the Wage Board recommendations and that since W.W.1 is more skilled than W.W. 2, W.W. 1 is entitled to be fixed in new Category VI and that W.W. 2 is entitled to be fixed in new Category V and that the action of the respondent in not granting new Category VI and new V to W.W. 1 and 2 (Gulam Ghouse and Mohammad Roza) respectively is not justified.

10. One of the contentions of the respondent's representative is that reference itself is invalid since there is no job description as Armature Winder so far as the respondent is concerned, but I have already held that the nature of work done by the petitioners is only Armature Winding work, though actually it is only re-winding that is done. So there is no force in the contention that the reference itself is invalid.

11. No doubt in the counter filed by the respondent one of the contentions raised is that the present reference relates to granting of higher category to the individual workman and that as the same is covered by the reference in I.D. No. 30 of 1967 the present claim is not justifiable and that I.D. No. 30 of 1967 is still pending. Though this contention has been raised in the counter, this aspect of the matter was not argued before me and so it is not necessary to consider this aspect of the matter. Further it is seen in the present reference that it is not as if the petitioners are claiming any higher category. All that they say is that as per the job description given in the Wage Board recommendations they ought to have been fitted in the particular category fixed by the Wage Board recommendations, whereas the respondent had fixed them in wrong category. If it is a case where the petitioners are claiming any higher category by way of any promotion, then different considerations might have arisen. All that the petitioners now want is that they should be fixed in the correct category as per the Wage Board recommendations.

12. No doubt the respondent's representative relied upon decision reported in *INDIAN HUME PIPE CO. v. ITS WORKMEN* [1964 (1) LLJ, page 412-Supreme Court] and contended that when once classification is fixed by virtue of an agreement, the Tribunal is not competent to change the classification, but a perusal of this decision shows that it does not apply to the acts of the present case. I have already observed that Ex. M. 2 has to be ignored in this case. So in the present case there is no question of any classification having been fixed pursuant to any agreement. All that has to be seen in the present case is whether the respondent had fixed the petitioners in proper category as per the Wage Board recommendations and now I have held that the petitioners have not been fixed in their proper categories.

13. For all the aforesaid reasons I hold on dispute referred to this Tribunal for adjudication that the action of the management of Kalyan Khani Workshop, Mandamari Division, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, in not granting

category VI (new) and Category V (new) to Gulam Ghous and Md. Roza, Armature Winders respectively as per the recommendations of the Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry is not justified and that they should be granted new categories VI and V respectively from 15.8.1967 since it is the date from which W.W.1 and 2 were placed in new Categories V and IV respectively. So the respondent is directed to fix the petitioners Gulam Ghouse and Mohammad Roza in new Category VI and V respectively with effect from 15.8.1967.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 4th day of October, 1972.

P. S. ANANTH, Presiding Officer.

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE:

Witnesses examined for <i>petitioners :</i>	Witnesses examined for <i>respondent :</i>
W.W.1 Gulam Ghouse	M.W.1 B. Ramachander
W.W.2 Mohammed Raza	M.W.2 Y. Adiseshaiah.
W.W.3 Ahmed Shereef.	

DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR PETITIONERS:

Ex. W. 1.—Letter dt. 31.8.68 of Asst. Labour Commissioner (C), Hyderabad addressed to Labour Enforcement Officer (C), Mancherial and copy to the Vice-President, S.C. Workers' Union, Bellampalli regarding enquiry of Labour Enforcement Officer, Mancherial.

Ex. W. 2.—Letter dt. 10.10.1968 of Labour Enforcement Officer (C), Mancherial addressed to the Vice-President, S. C. Workers' Union Bellampalli stating that the enquiry will be holding in the Office of the Assistant Engineer (Workshop) Kalyan Khani, on 25.10.1968.

Ex. W. 3.—Letter dt. 29.11.1968 of Asst. Labour Commissioner (C), Hyderabad addressed to the Agent, S.C.C. Ltd., Mancherial Division regarding payment of appropriate category wages in respect of Gulam Ghouse.

Ex. W. 4.—Confirmation orders issued by the Agent, S.C. Co. Ltd., Mandamari Division on 31.10.1966 to Ghulam Ghouse as Winder Category VII.

Ex. W. 5.—Extract from the report on the categorisation of Tradesmen at Kothagudem and Yellandu Collieries.

DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR RESPONDENT:

Ex. M. 1.—Work allotment register of Mandamari Workshop (Winding Section).

Ex. M. 1(a).—Work allotted to Gulam Ghouse on 5.9.1968 and 6.9.1968.

Ex. M. 1(b).—Work allotted to Gulam Ghouse on 8.9.68.

Ex. M. 1(c).—Work allotted to Mohammed Raza on 5.9.1968 to 7.9.1968.

Ex. M. 1(d).—Work allotted to Gulam Ghouse on 26.9.1968 to 30.9.1968.

Ex. M. 2.—Minutes of discussions held at Hyderabad on 11th and 12th February 1966 between the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, and the workmen in the presence of Sri R. Lall and Kanti Mehta, Members of Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry regarding categorisation of the daily rated workers of the S.C. Co. Ltd.

New Delhi, the 14th November, 1972

S.O. 3998.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kalyanpur Lime and Cement Works Limited, Post Office Banjari, District Shahabad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1972.

(AWARD)

[No. L-29011 (34)/71-LRIV]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 3, DHANBAD.

Present :

Shri B. S. Tripathi.—Presiding Officer.

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Kalyanpur Lime & Cement Works Ltd., P.O. Banjari, Dist. Shahabad.

AND

Their workmen.—represented by the Kumayu Range Quarries Labour Union, Banjari (Shahabad)

Appearances :

For Employers.—Shri D. Narsingh, Advocate.

For Workmen.—Mahant Mahadevanand Giri, President Shri Chhattar Singh, General Secretary of Kumayu Range Quarries Labour Union, Banjari (Shahabad) and Shri B. Lal, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Lime Stone Quarry.

STATE : Bihar

Dated, Dhanbad, the 31st October, 1972.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour & Employment) being of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the parties mentioned above with respect to the matters specified in the schedule of reference, referred the said dispute Under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act to this Tribunal for adjudication by their Order No. L-29011/34/71-LR-IV dated the 20th August, 1971. The schedule is extracted below:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of workmen of the Quarry of M/s. Kalyanpur Lime & Cement Works Limited for a Gratuity Scheme is justified? If so, what should be that Scheme?"

2. The employer as well as the workmen filed their written statements in support of their respective claims and each party also filed rejoinder to the written statement of the opposite party. In the meantime the parties amicably settled their dispute out of Court and on 26th October, 1972 filed a joint petition of compromise with a prayer to make an award according to the terms agreed upon by the parties. The representatives of the parties to the reference verified the same before me.

3. I have carefully gone through the compromise petition in the light of the reference aforesaid and the cases of the parties and I find that the terms of settlement are quite fair, just and equitable. I see no reason as to why the compromise petition shall not be accepted and the reference shall not be disposed of in terms thereof. I accept the same and make an award accordingly. The compromise petition will form part of the award as Annexure 'A' thereof.

4. Let the award be submitted to the Central Government Under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. S. TRIPATHI, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL No. 3, DHANBAD

At Camp—Indrapuri

Dist. Shahabad (Bihar)

REFERENCE NO. 1 OF 1971

Parties

Employers in relation to M/s Kalyanpur Lime &
Cement Works Limited, P. O. Banjari,
AND
their workmen.

In the matter of the introduction of a Gratuity Scheme
for the workmen of the Quarries of the said
employers.

JOINT PETITION OF THE PARTIES

The parties aforesaid beg to submit as under :

1. The issue referred to this Tribunal for adjudication *vide*
Central Government order dated the 20th October 1971
reads as follows :

"Whether the demand of the workmen of the quarries
of Messrs Kalyanpur Lime & Cement Works
Limited for a Gratuity Scheme is justified. If so,
what should be the scheme."

2. After the said reference was made to this Tribunal,
the Parliament enacted "The Payment of Gratuity Act,
1972", hereinafter referred to as the Gratuity Act.

3. In terms of Sec. 1(4) of the Gratuity Act, the Central
Government has notified in the official gazette that the Act
would come into force from 16th September 1972.

4. Sec. 4 of the Gratuity Act has prescribed a Scheme of
Gratuity which is applicable to the whole of India. In
view of the said Scheme the parties to these proceedings
have entered into an Agreement on the following terms :

- (a) The management undertakes to implement the said
Gratuity Act and the Scheme in respect of the
workmen employed in its quarries;
- (b) The workmen in view of the aforesaid undertaking
of the management declare that they have no
further dispute with the management in the matter
of a Gratuity Scheme for the workmen employed
in the management's quarries;
- (c) The dispute referred to this Tribunal for adjudi-
cation stands fully resolved by this agreement;
- (d) The management and the workmen, in the afore-
said circumstances, shall jointly apply to the Tri-
bunal by submitting a copy of this agreement to
give its award in terms thereof.
- (e) The parties shall bear their respective costs of
these proceedings.

5. The parties, therefore, jointly submit this agreement to
this Tribunal with a prayer that it may be pleased to give
its award in the present reference in terms of this agree-
ment to the effect that the dispute referred to the Tribunal
for adjudication stands fully resolved and that there is no
further dispute between the parties in the matter referred
to it.

6. It is prayed that the Tribunal may be pleased to take
this agreement on record and give its award in terms
thereof.

For the Workmen :
(Sd.) President.
(Sd.) Gen. Secy.
B. LALL, Advocate.

For the Employer :
S. K. CHATTERJEE,
Chief Adm. Officer.
D. NARSINGH, Advocate.
B. S. TRIPATHI, Presiding Officer.

26th October, 1972.

New Delhi, the 22nd November, 1972

S.O. 3999.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause
(1) of article 258 of the Constitution the President, with
the consent of the Governments of Manipur, Tripura and
Meghalaya, hereby entrusts to the Governments of respec-
tive States the functions of Central Government under the
Trade Unions Act, 1926 (16 of 1926), in relation to trade
unions whose objects are not confined to but whose head
office is situated in the said States.

[No. S-13013/1/72-LR.I]

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक 22 नवम्बर, 1972

क्र० आ० 3999.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 258 के खण्ड (1)
द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मणिपुर, त्रिपुरा और मेघालय की
सरकारों की सम्मति से, उन व्यवसाय संघों के संबंध में, जिनके कार्यक्षेत्र उक्त
राज्यों तक ही सीमित नहीं है, किन्तु जिनका प्रधान कार्यालय उक्त राज्यों में
स्थित है, उन राज्यों की सरकारों को, व्यवसाय संघ अधिनियम, 1926 (1926
का 16) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार के कृत्य एतद्द्वारा सौंपे हैं।

[सं० एस-13013/1/72-एल आर-I]

The 23rd November, 1972

S.O. 4000.—Whereas a vacancy has occurred in the office
of the presiding officer of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad,
constituted by the notification of the Government of India
in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O.
103, dated the 11th January, 1960;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of section
8 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the
Central Government hereby appoints Shri Durgeshwar Dayal
Seth as the presiding officer of the said Industrial Tribunal,
with effect from the 13th November, 1972.

[No. S. 11025/24/72-LRI(i)]

दिनांक 23 नवम्बर, 1972

क्र० आ० 4000.—यतः भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम और
रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. क्र० आ० 103, तारीख 11
जनवरी, 1960 द्वारा गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, धनबाद के
पीठासीन अधिकारी का पद रिक्त हो गया है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का
14) की धारा 8 के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार
एतद्वारा श्री दुर्गेश्वर दयाल सेठ को 13 नवम्बर, 1972 से उक्त
औद्योगिक अधिकरण का पीठासीन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती

[सं० एस. 11025/24/72 एल. आर. I (i)]

S.O. 4001.—WHEREAS the Central Government is of the presiding officer of the Labour Court (No. 2), Dhanbad, constituted by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1697, dated the 22nd May, 1965;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of section 8 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Durgeshwar Dayal Seth as the presiding officer of the said Labour Court, with effect from the 13th November, 1972.

[No. S. 11025/24/72-LRI(ii)]
S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

का.आ. 4001.—यतः भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना स. का. आ. 1697 तारीख 22 मई, 1965 द्वारा गठित श्रम न्यायालय (सं. 2), धनबाद के पीठासीन अधिकारी का पद रिक्त हो गया है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 8 के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा श्री दुर्गेश्वर दयाल सेठ को 13 नवम्बर, 1972 से उक्त श्रम न्यायालय का पीठासीन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. एस-11025/24/72-एल आर (2).]

एस. एस. सहास्रनमन, अपर सचिव।

New Delhi, the 22nd November, 1972

ORDER

S.O. 4002.—WHEREAS the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Darabshaw B. Cursetjee's Sons (Bombay) Private Limited, Bombay, their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

AND, WHEREAS, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE—I

"Whether the management of Messrs. Darabshaw B. Cursetjee's Sons (Bombay) Private Limited, 7, Kumpta Street, Ballard Estate, Bombay-1 are justified in dismissing from their services Shri S. Salaudin, permanent Assistant Supervisor as from 21st June, 1972 by their order No. 1652/72/KMJ:CP, dated 21st June, 1972? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. L-31012/2/72-P&D]

नई दिल्ली, बिनांक 22 नवम्बर, 1972

आदेश

का.आ. 4002.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स दराबशा बी० कुरसेतजीज सन्स (मुम्बई) प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, मुम्बई के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्द्वारा, उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण मुम्बई को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स दराबशा बी० कुरसेतजीज सन्स (मुम्बई) प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, 7, "कुम्पटा स्ट्रीट बेलर्ड इस्टेट, मुम्बई-1 के प्रबंधन का, श्री एस० सलाउदीन, स्थायी सहायक पर्यवेक्षक को, 21 जून, 1972 से अपने आदेश सं० 1652/72-के एम जे, सी पी, तारीख 21 जून, 1972 द्वारा सेवा से निकाल देना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[सं. एल. 31012/2/72-पी एण्ड डी]

New Delhi, the 22nd November, 1972

S.O. 4003.—In pursuance of section 17 of the In-sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulations of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby extends the period specified for the purpose of inviting objections or suggestions on the draft of the Madras Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1971 published with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 5434, dated the 9th November, 1971, from the 15th December, 1971, by a period upto the date of expiration of two months from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

2. Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the expiry of the period so specified will be considered by the Central Government.

[No. S-67014/2/71-P&D]

का.आ. 4003.—डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 5434, तारीख 9 नवम्बर, 1971 के साथ प्रकाशित मद्रास अन्रजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) संशोधन स्कीम, 1971 के प्रारूप पर आक्षेप या सुझाव मांगने के प्रयोजन के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि को 15 दिसम्बर, 1971 से इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से 2 मास समाप्त हो जाने की तारीख तक की अवधि के लिए एतद्द्वारा बढ़ाती है।

2. उक्त प्रारूप के बारे में किसी व्यक्ति से इस प्रकार विनिर्दिष्ट तारीख से पूर्व प्राप्त होने वाले आक्षेपों या सुझावों पर केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विचार किया जाएगा।

[सं. एस-67014/71-पी एण्ड डी]

बी० शंकरलिंगम, अपर सचिव

The 24th November, 1972

S.O. 4004.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Arbitrator, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Food Corporation of India, Bombay and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th November, 1972.

[No. I-31013/3/72-P&D]

V. SANKARALINGAM, Under Secy.

AWARD

The Food Corporation of India, Bombay and the Transport & Dock Workers' Union, Bombay entered into an agreement under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referring the following dispute for my arbitration (Section 10-A) on 4th August, 1972.

SPECIFIC MATTER IN DISPUTE

- (a) Revision of the incentive piece-rate scheme of foodgrain workers working in the Bombay Docks and to evolve an incentive piece-rate scheme for foodgrain workers working in the Bombay Godowns considering the demands raised by the Union, the views of the management and recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers; and
- (b) the retrospective date from which the incentive piece-rate schemes shall become operative.

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour & Employment under their Order No. L.31013/3/72-P&D dated 2nd September, 1972 intimated me about the aforesaid arbitration agreement and desired me to proceed in the matter.

I addressed the parties on 8th September, 1972 inviting their attention to their earlier agreement and Government of India Order referred to above and also requested them to appear before me on Monday the 18th September, 1972. As scheduled the parties appeared before me and submitted written statements and also gave a copy each to the other party. In this meeting preliminaries were discussed and it was felt that the time limit set out in the agreement viz "31st August, 1972 or the date 15 days after publication of this agreement in the official Gazette whichever is later" was obviously unrealistic and the parties agreed to extend the time limit upto 25th October, 1972. The parties sent a letter to that effect on 22nd September, 1972. The date was further extended to 10th November, 1972 at the instance of the parties.

I heard the parties jointly and separately on 18th, 19th, 20th and 22nd September, 1972 and on various dates thereafter. I also visited for an on-the-spot study of F.C.I. godowns at General Motors, Sewree and Borivili and also visited the docks to observe the filling and stitching processes of fertiliser bags. I was accompanied on these visits by the representatives of the Food Corporation of India and the said Union and all these visits were "surprise visits". The management and the Union co-operated very well in organising these surprise visits. It was possible for all of us thereby to observe actual conditions, as they were obtained generally, as against a stage-managed affair, not so uncommon when Time and Motion Studies are made or Incentive Schemes are discussed, as in the present case.

The Food Corporation of India in their written statement as well as through their arguments during proceedings stated that the issues involved were discussed by them with the Union and it had reached a stage of near settlement but for the sudden and subsequent withdrawal of the Union and their resorting to a strike the F.C.I. signed the Arbitration Agreement before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Bombay. The Food Corporation of India contended that the Union felt that though the work of Loaders was more onerous compared to that of Fillers, the total piece-rate remuneration of Fillers was more. They demanded that there should be parity between the piece-rate remuneration of Fillers and Loaders and in order to bring about the proposed parity the only alternative was to increase the earnings of Loaders. It was also agreed that while doing so, some increase was necessary to be allowed to Fillers or otherwise the revision would not be conducive to industrial peace. Based mainly on these considerations, certain schedules were evolved giving parity at a certain levels to Loaders *vis-a-vis* the Fillers. While discussions on this issue were going on Fillers resorted to a 'go-slow' demanding that their earnings should be increased and that their time-scale should be comparable to that of Loaders. The go-slow continued for about 3 months and considering the integrated nature of operations, the F.C.I. suggested that—

(1) An integrated group Incentive Piece-rate Scheme be formulated, combining Fillers, Stitchers and Loaders who may be paid at composite rate, such integrated group scheme be implemented from the date of the Award and even the apportionment for payment of earnings between the Loaders, Fillers and Stitchers could be decided by the Union within the composite rate referred to above.

- (2) Any Scheme to be attractive to all the workers involved viz. Fillers, Stitchers and Loaders, should ensure more or less uniform benefits to all categories and if not there is likely to be resentment from a section of workers which will cease to be an incentive scheme.

Shri Kotwal representing the Transport & Dock Workers' Union while generally agreeing in principle to the integrated group and the composite gang, felt that it was too early to introduce such a scheme in the existing set of circumstances. There was a general consensus that such a composite scheme could be ideal but it would be too early to introduce such a radical change at this stage. In their written statement the Transport & Dock Workers' Union stated that the Food Corporation employees over 5000 workmen who handle foodgrain and fertilizers in the docks as well as their godowns in Bombay. Since the departmentalisation, there was hardly any time to evolve a scientific Incentive Piece-rate Scheme and a revision of the existing scheme, therefore, was long overdue to ensure legitimate dues to workers as a result of their higher production. The Government of India appointed Central Wage Board for Port & Dock Workers and the reference included the wages of these workmen also. The said Wage Board in their report unanimously recommended that in the light of the revision of the wage structure, the Incentive Piece-rate Scheme should be revised. It had also recommended that wherever possible Incentive Piece-rate Scheme should also be introduced where such scheme/schemes are not in operation. The Union has been agitating for a revision of the existing scheme since 1970. Protracted negotiations were held for a period of a year and a half and as no settlement was arrived at the Union was left over with no other alternative but to go on strike which lasted only for two days, and was settled by reference of the aforesaid dispute to an agreed Arbitrator. While arguing the case further Shri Kotwal stated that the present scheme in the docks as well as godown suffer from many defects. It discriminates substantially between workmen working in the docks and those working at various godowns. There is at least an element of incentive in the Scheme in operation in the docks whereas a flat Piece-rate Scheme without any incentive is applicable to godown workers. The Union, therefore, suggests that an identical Incentive Piece-rate Scheme should be evolved for both the sets of workmen.

The wages and service conditions at the time of departmentalisation were different from the wages recommended by the Wage Board and accepted by the Food Corporation of India for their workmen. Formerly, the workmen were paid at the daily rate whereas a definite time-scale is applicable to them now along with other additional benefits like House rent and Compensatory as well as Dearness Allowances. As a result of this there is a substantial rise in the daily wages of these workmen and therefore it is the genuine demand of the Union that this increase in the daily wage of the workmen should be reflected in their Incentive Piece-rate earnings.

The Union also further argued that the Incentive Piece-rate Scheme as applicable to shore and stevedore workers working in the docks is a comprehensive scheme in which all factors like idle period have been taken into consideration and have been paid for. There are tally clerks employed by the stevedores to record the output. Workmen under reference working under Food Corporation of India do not get paid for idle time nor their output is recorded by tally clerks so as to give them benefit of reduction in the datum line in accordance with the idle time etc. This means that the workmen suffer loss of wages and Food Corporation of India gains considerably on the wages that they would have been required to pay for the tally clerks if appointed.

Both the parties made out their case well but there was neither any progress nor a possibility of an agreed solution. For any incentive scheme one of the prerequisite is to fix a norm or a datum. On this issue itself there was no agreement as the Union wanted to start at a much lower level of production while the management insisted on the existing ones, at best, if not further increased.

Finally it was decided that we should take 50 Kgs. fertiliser handling schedule as the base and the discussion circled around the norm. While arguing their case, Shri Kumar of the Food Corporation of India stated, that the claim of the Union that, datum for 50 kgs. fertiliser bags should be taken at the output level of 800 bags, cannot be accepted. The existing settlement gives for 100 kgs. fertiliser bags a datum of output level of 800 bags and the payment for filling/loading 50 kgs. bags is arrived at by reducing the rates to 60 per cent mentioned in the schedule thereon. Thus such a departure from the existing datum would not be justified. He also further stated that when the arbitrator visited for 'on-the-spot study' and that too as a surprise visit, the fillers had, on an average filled in 1,460 bags per gang even two hours before the closing time and therefore, it is our contention that under the existing conditions of work, the fillers could be expected to give a minimum output of at least 1,300 bags and the loaders about 2,000 bags. He argued that the incentive piece-rate should be made applicable only from the above level of output.

The parties argued their points well while discussing the rates, earnings, employment opportunities, date of effect of the scheme etc. and I do not propose to recapitulate or enclose copies of various proposals submitted by the parties, as the trend and content of the discussion changed too often. I feel that mentioning these various points of view will not be of any use particularly as there was a wide gulf between the two, even to the extent of suggesting that there is no need to have an incentive scheme for the godowns or any overall review in case of the present scheme in docks, though the specific issue in dispute before me as per agreement, is review and evolving of such schemes.

I have reduced the number of schedules and also eliminated the need for different rates for mechanical and manual handling. In fact, the F.C.I. argued that mechanical handling is paid at the manual rate and the workmen are already enjoying additional benefit though the handling has been made easier due to mechanical appliances. Union argued their point and I thought instead of providing too many schedules, one schedule should cover both.

Similarly since the schedule regarding handling of 50 kgs. fertiliser bags was taken as the basis, with F.C.I. and Union differing very largely about the starting slab for piece-rate, I have suggested 66-2/3 percentage increase on rates of the same schedule for big bags. While arriving at the rates, the present party computation and agreement between the F.C.I. and Union has not been disturbed.

Apart from other considerations it is also necessary to keep in view the terms and conditions of service of other labour engaged in similar trade. On an informal enquiry from outside agencies it was revealed that a loader earned above Rs. 400 and in peak days gets up to Rs. 500 per month. They do not have however other benefits as the workers employed by the F.C.I. Average earning of a loader of the Dock Labour Board is much more than the earnings of a loader of the F.C.I. mainly because the average employment works out to 24.7 shifts per month as against 16.7 in Docks and I understand 21 in godowns. I expect that with a judicious policy it should be possible for the F.C.I. to utilise the available manpower at its best. I am mentioning

this position specifically to avoid wrong comparison of actual earnings of loaders under F.C.I. with loaders of Dock Labour Board even after the revised scheme is introduced as it would not be the correct index for the simple reason that benefit of the incentive scheme will be derived by the F.C.I. workmen only for the days of their work and will not have effect on other days where they will be governed by Minimum Guaranteed Wages.

While the Union insisted that the F.C.I. workmen should get as much as that of their counterpart in the Dock Labour Board, the F.C.I. felt that the two cannot be compared as their nature of work is different and cannot be considered identical. I have considered both these views and enough can be said on both sides.

There are too many factors, which inhibit introduction of a fool-proof scientific scheme of incentive. Various systems adopted in developed countries pre-suppose a single agency control, a continuous inflow of work, standardisation of processes, pre-determined norms, single workman, or groups formed of specific workmen, proper analysis of quantum of load anticipated and reasonably satisfactory man-power planning to cope up with the available load. Unfortunately in so far as the present issue is concerned, not even one condition mentioned above is fully met. The inflow of work is not guaranteed, processes are diverse and different, there are no accepted norms as such, the workmen go on rotating and changing and worst of all there are too many people for the available work-load so much so that in some months of the year 1971-72 the Fillers and Stitches have an average employment of two to three days in a month, the overall position being 11.8 for Fillers, 11.1 for Stitches and 16.7 for Loaders. Though these figures show an improvement as compared to last year's figures, considering the cost point of view, it is most unsatisfactory as it means that workmen are paid a substantial amount when there is no work for them and not so much when they have work to do. Moreover there are too many agencies involved in the day to day operation of handling and transport. In such circumstances perhaps all that an Arbitrator can do is to see whether he can give added incentive to willing workmen to do more, achieve more, and produce more and to gain somewhat more on the days of work. I, therefore, while giving the Award do not claim to have provided a scientific scheme. I presume parties before me were conscious of this position and in fact their discussion could not bring about an agreed settlement and perhaps they shifted the burden by agreeing to Arbitration.

I am faced, as it is, with too many constraints, checks and controls, earlier understandings, traditional payments, parity of earnings, near settlements reached by parties at different levels, comparison with earnings of dock workers and as is obvious these factors operate so much against each other that any perfectly rational or scientific scheme of incentives can hardly be drawn.

I have, however, given fullest consideration to arguments forwarded by the Food Corporation of India and the Union and also taken into consideration, among other things, the recent unrest among fillers, absence of idle time payment in the scheme, absence of continuous work-load, over-staffing and the consequent substantial expenditure because of minimum guarantee and attendance allowance etc. I am also conscious that in the schedules as awarded at some places the increase in the rate may appear little erratic or sometimes even little arbitrary but the factor given above are responsible for such seemingly inconsistent patches in the schedule. I anticipate that in due course with a proper co-ordination, better supervision and above all better man-power planning, the rates prescribed will give enough incentive to workers to earn more by producing more and corresponding benefit to the F.C.I. by better turn-over. The position today as earlier stated is not satisfactory. In spite of better rates and progressively loaded schedules, the monthly income of the workmen, particularly of the Fillers may not reflect very high increase due to present employment position arising out of too big a complement of Fillers, Stitches, Loaders etc. It is in this background that I anticipate that actual increase in expenditure on administering of piece-rate wages as per newly awarded rates will not be very high. In fact the available workload will be cleared early and the increase in expenditure is going to partially offset by saving due to quicker

turnover, payment of piece-rate for less number of days, though at higher rate, as compared to more number of days at present rate and if proper work conditions are provided, the awarded schemes should work well.

One of the salient features of the arbitration proceedings was the insistence and emphasis of the Food Corporation of India on their earlier suggested schedule which they claimed, had been, more or less agreed to, by the Union and a completely new approach by Shri Kotwal in putting up proposals based on cost per ton, general labour-cost computation etc. The Union representatives, therefore, came up every time with new schedules claiming rates on higher side and due to the aforesaid approach of the parties it resulted in denying any fruitful basis for discussion as such, or any possibility of arriving at any agreed solution. It was, therefore, necessary for me, while awarding the new rates to take into consideration the existing rates as well as the near settlement claimed between the Food Corporation of India and the Union. It is possible that at some levels in the schedules increases likely to be earned by the workmen concerned may not be, as anticipated but it would hardly be appropriate to introduce the revised rates which have no relation whatsoever to the existing rates.

It was in this context that I had to work out different schedules which would take into consideration points argued before me and also various factors earlier mentioned that have bearing on this important issue.

I must make a special mention of Shri Sathe, Deputy Manager (Finance), Food Corporation of India who helped me in working out the cost, rates and likely earnings of different categories, at different levels, and different rates. I place on record my thanks to him for his methodical working in helping me to prepare different schedules without making any observation whatsoever regarding the likely effect of such rates, if introduced. Shri Sathe was a great help to me in working out the calculations of awarded rates reflecting my formula and my way of thinking.

I also place on record my thanks for the co-operation given by the officers of the Food Corporation of India and particularly by Shri Kumar, Deputy Zonal Manager and Shri Manohar Kotwal and Shri Ramakant Desai representing the Union, throughout the arbitration proceedings.

I award as under:

1. Piece-rates payable to fillers and loaders at Bombay Docks for handling of small bags (fertilisers/food-grains) shall be as in Schedule I. Piece-rates payable to fillers and loaders for handling big food-grains/fertiliser bags shall be arrived at by increasing the respective rates by 66-2/3 per cent.

These rates shall be applicable to both mechanical as well as manual handling of cargo. The existing system of computing the output of loaders shall remain unchanged.

2. Piece-rates payable to stitchers at Bombay Docks for handling foodgrains and fertilisers (small bags) shall be as in Schedule 'C'. The same rates shall be applicable to stitchers at Bombay godowns for handling foodgrains and fertilisers (small bags). In case of big bags the rate indicated in Schedule 'C' shall be increased by 20 per cent.

3. Workmen, covered under this award, both in Docks and Godowns, shall be paid, an extra amount of Rs. 1/- (Rupee One) per head, per shift, if such workmen, though booked, are not provided with work, resulting into forced idle period exceeding one hour at a stretch or more than 1½ hours or more in two spans in one shift, w.e.f. 1st January, 1973.

4. For all purposes Small Bag would mean a bag of 50 kgs. or under and a Big Bag would mean a bag above 50 kgs.

5. Mukedams of loading and filling gangs in the Docks and of loading gangs in Godowns shall be paid Rs. 3/- extra over and above the average piece-rate earnings of each individual in the gangs supervised by them.

The rates for various services rendered in the Godown shall be as under:—

Service	Rate per 100 bags
(i) Loading/unloading of trucks including destacking/stacking.	as per schedules A/B as applicable.
(ii) Loading/unloading of covered wagons including destacking/stacking.	Additional rate of Rs. 1.50 p at each output level of schedules A/B as applicable.
(iii) Loading/unloading of wagons when trucks are taken alongside either at railheads or godowns.	The rate applicable for this service shall be arrived at by deducting Rupee One only from the rates given in schedules A or B as applicable.
(iv) Weighment.	Rs. 1.80 per 100 bags (big or small).
(v) Stitching	As per schedule 'C'.
(vi) Waraferi	As per schedule A/B as applicable.
(vii) Overbagging	Rs. 3/- per 100 bag (small or big).
(viii) Kachha Filling of loose pala.	Does not arise as the parties have agreed to eliminate this service.
(ix) Sample Weighment	Rs. 9/-.
(x) Loading or unloading of trucks with 100% weighment.	1.1/2 Waraferi rate plus weighment rate.
(xi) Loading or unloading of wagons with 100% weighment.	1.1/2 Waraferi rate plus weighment rate plus Rs. 1.50.
(xii) Physical verification.	1.1/2 Waraferi rate plus rate for weighment.
(xiii) Standardisation on the resultant number of bags.	1.3/4 Waraferi rate plus weighment rate plus Rs. 1/- for opening seams of bags plus stitching rate (stitching rate shall be paid separately to Stitchers)
(xiv) Rebagging	1.3/4 Waraferi rate plus rate for over-bagging plus stitching rate for actual number of bags stitched (stitching rate shall be paid separately to stitchers.)
(xv) Filling loose pala or conversion including stacking.	Does not arise as this work is being attended to by time rated workers. This arrangement is acceptable to both the Union and the management.
(xvi) Cleaning	
(xvii) Silo Operation : a. Unloading of cargo from trucks carrying them to Silo points, arrange bags, cut open the mouths of bags and empty them into the pits.	Rate as per Schedule 'A' plus Rs. 3/- (Three) at each output level.

- (b) Filling gunnies with re-claimed grains upto prescribed limit from bulk storage, stitching bags, stacking/loading into trucks or wagons. Double the Waraferi rate plus weighthment rate plus stitching rate, which should be paid separately to stitchers.

(xviii) *Gift Pareels*: Rate per 100 packages,

a. Packages weighing upto 55 Lbs. Rs. 4.25

(b) Packages weighing above 55 Lbs. upto 100 Lbs. Rs. 7.00

(c) Packages weighing above 100 Lbs. upto 200 Lbs. Rs. 14.00

(d) Packages weighing above 200 Lbs. upto 400 Lbs. Rs. 28.00

(e) Packages weighing above 400 Lbs. upto 800 Lbs. Rs. 56.00

(f) Packages weighing above 800 Lbs. Rs. 115.00

- (xix) *Loading/unloading of gunny bales including destacking/stacking either from or into trucks or from or into wagons.*

a. Bales having 300 bags or less. Paise 45 per bale.

b. Bales having more than 300 bags. Paise 90 per bale.

The above rates shall be increased by 50% for height beyond 3 layers *provided* the fork lifts are *not* used.

- (xx) The rates given in item (ii) of services mentioned are for loading/unloading of covered wagons. The extra entitlement shall be to the extent of Rupee one per 100 bags and 33.1/3% for KCX (open wagons) and Box wagons respectively.

- (xxi) The normal height for stacking of bags shall be as under :—

Category of bags	Height/Layers
* Big bags	10—12
Small bags	16—18

The rate shall be increased by 50 per cent for the Extra Payment for the actual number of bags (Big & Small) stacked beyond normal height.

- (xxii) For any lead beyond 60 ft. for carrying of bags an extra payment equal to 50 per cent of the basic rate for such carriage shall be added for every 30 ft. distance or fraction thereof. Distance shall be measured in respect of the bags actually carried and along the actual route followed.

Incentive piece rate schemes awarded above shall become operative with effect from 1.1.1972. Arrears arising out of the same shall be paid before 28th February, 1973.

S. K. GOKHALE, Arbitrator.

Enclosures :

Schedule I Statement showing Piece-rates payable to Fillers and Loaders at Bombay Docks for handling of small bags (Fertilisers/Foodgrains).

Schedule A (statement showing Piece-rates payable to Loaders at Bombay Godowns for Foodgrains Big Bags.

Schedule B Statement showing Piece-rate payable to Loaders at Bombay Godown for Fertilisers- Small Bags.

Schedule C Statement showing Piece-rate payable to Stitchers at Bombay Godowns and Docks for handling Foodgrains and Fertilisers (Small Bags).

SCHEDULE I

Statement showing Piece-Rates Payable to Fillers and Loaders at Bombay Docks for handling of small Bags (Fertilisers/Foodgrains)

Output in Bags	Fillers Loaders	
	Rate per 100 bags	Rate per 100 bags
(1)	(2)	(3)
	Rs.	Rs.
800	6.18	5.27
900	6.30	5.33
1000	7.00	5.39
1100	7.28	5.47
1200	7.50	5.54
1300	8.08	5.67
1400	8.39	5.85
1500	8.67	6.07
1600	8.90	6.19
1700	9.12	6.31
1800	9.30	6.48
1900	9.47	6.65
2000	9.62	6.82
2100		7.27
2200		7.42
2300		7.57
2400		7.72
2500		7.83
2600		7.94
2700		8.06
2800		8.15
2900		8.24
3000		8.34

Note : Piece-rates payable to fillers and loaders for handling big fertiliser bags shall be arrived at by increasing the respective rates mentioned above by 66.2/3%. The rates so arrived shall be the same for handling of foodgrains and fertiliser bags.

These rates are applicable to both mechanical as well as manual handling of cargo.

The existing system of computing the output of loaders shall remain unchanged.

SCHEDULE A

Statement Showing Piece-Rates Payable to Loaders at Bombay Godowns for Foodgrains—Big Bags.

Stacking : 10—12

Slab of Output	Rate Per 100 Bags
(1)	(2)
	Rs.
800	7.81
900	8.19
1000	8.56
1100	8.67
1200	8.73
1300	8.77
1400	8.80
1500	8.90
1600	8.99
1700	9.10
1800	9.20
1900	9.31
2000	9.42
2100	9.54
2200	9.63
2300	9.75
2400	9.87
2500	9.97

SCHEDULE B

Statement Showing Piece-Rates Payable to Loaders at
Bombay Godowns for Fertilisers—Small Bags
Stacking 16—18

Slab of Output	Rate Per 100 Bags
	Rs.
800	4.87
900	4.90
1000	4.95
1100	5.16
1200	5.23
1300	5.46
1400	5.98
4500	6.11
1600	6.24
1700	6.40
1800	6.54
1900	6.65
2000	6.85

Note : The rates for handling big fertilizer bags shall be arrived at by increasing the respective rates mentioned above by 66⅔%. The normal stacking height for big bags will be 10—12.

SCHEDULE C

Statement Showing Piece-Rate Payable to Sttchers
at Bombay Godowns and Docks for Handling Foodgrains
and Fertilisers (Small Bags)

STITCHERS—SMALL BAGS	
Slab output in Bags	Rate per 100 bags
(1)	(2)
	Rs.
800	1.85
900	1.89
1000	2.10
1100	2.18
1200	2.25
1300	2.42
1400	2.52
1500	2.60
1600	2.67
1700	2.74
1800	2.79
1900	2.84
2000	2.89

Note : In case of big bags the above Rate shall be increased by 20 per cent.

Delhi, the 18th November, 1972

S.O. 4005.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 26th November, 1972 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VII except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Madhya Pradesh namely:—

"Village Pahadi, settlement No. 131, Tehsil Murwara, District Jabalpur".

[S-38013/15/72/HI]

मयी दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 1972

क्र० प्रा० 4005—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नवम्बर, 1972 के 26वें दिन को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 (धारा 44 और 45 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी हैं) और अध्याय 5 और 6 (धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी हैं) के उपबन्ध मध्य प्रदेश के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :—

"पहाड़ी गांव, बस्ती संख्या 131, तहसील भुरवारा, जिला जबलपुर"।

[एस-38013 (15)/72-एच० प्राई०]

S.O. 4006.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 26th day of November, 1972 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI [except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act, shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Madhya Pradesh namely:—

"1. The area within Govindpura Industrial Estate Bhopal and

2. Village Kolma Kalla and Khasra Nos. 177/2, 184/2, 186/1, 186/2 and 188 in Tehsil Hazur, District Sehore in the State of Madhya Pradesh".

[S-38013/28/71/HI]

क्र० प्रा० 4006—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नवम्बर, 1972 के 26वें दिन को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 (धारा 44 और 45) के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्ति की जा चुकी हैं) और अध्याय 5 और 6 (धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी हैं) के उपबन्ध मध्य प्रदेश के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :—

"1. गोविन्दपुर औद्योगिक संपदा भोपाल के अन्तर्गत माने वाला क्षेत्र और

2. मध्य प्रदेश के राज्य के जिला सेहोरे, तहसील हाजूर में कोल्मा कल्ला गांव और खसरा संख्या 177/2, 184/2, 186/1, 186/2, और 188।"

[एस-38013 (28)/71 एच० प्राई०]

Delhi, The 21st November, 1972

S.O. 4007.—Whereas the departmentally run Government of India presses under the Control of Ministry of Works and Housing (Chief Controller of Printing and Stationery New Delhi) specified in Schedule I annexed. (hereinafter referred to as the said establishments) have applied for exemption under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas the employees of the said presses are in such benefits are on the whole not less favourable to such employees than the benefits provided under Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme) in relation to employees in any other establishment/factory of a similar character;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the said Act, and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule II annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said presses from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme and in pursuance of sub-section (3) of the said Section 17, the Central Government hereby directs that the employer in relation to the said presses shall pay within fifteen days of the close of the month to the Employees Provident Fund, Inspection charges at the rate of 0.09 per cent (zero point zero nine per cent) of the pay (basic wages, dearness allowance, retaining allowance, if any, and cash value of food concession admissible thereon) for the time being payable to the employees of the said presses who would have become members under the said Scheme but for this exemption.

SCHEDULE—I

1. Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi.
2. Government of India Press, Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi.
3. Government of India Press, Ring Road, New Delhi.
4. Government of India Press, Simla.
5. Government of India Press, Gangtok, Sikkim.
6. Government of India Press, K. S. Roy Road, Calcutta.
7. Government of India Press, Temple Street, Calcutta.
8. Government of India Press, Santragachi, Howrah.
9. Government of India Press, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh.
10. Government of India Press, Nilokheri.
11. Government of India Press, Faridabad.
12. Government of India Press, Nasik.
13. Government of India Press, Coimbatore.
14. Government of India Press, Koratty.

SCHEDULE—II

1. The employer shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner as the Central Government may, from time to time, prescribe.
2. The employer shall furnish to each employee an annual Statement of account or Pass Book.
3. All expenses involved in the administration of the fund including the maintenance of accounts, submission of accounts and returns, transfer of accumulations, payment of inspection charges etc., shall be borne by the employer.
4. Where an employee who is already member of the Employees' Provident Fund (Statutory Fund) or the Provident Fund of another exempted establishment is employed in his establishment, the employer shall immediately enroll him as a member of the fund of the establishment, and accept the past accumulations in respect of such employee and credit to his account.
5. The employer shall enhance the rate of provident fund contribution appropriately if the rate of provident fund contributions for the class of establishments in which his estab-

lishment falls is enhanced under the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 so that the benefits under the provident fund scheme of the establishment shall not become less favourable than the benefit provided under the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952.

6. Notwithstanding anything contained in the provident fund rules of the establishment if the amount payable to any member, upon his ceasing to be an employee of the establishment or transferable on his transfer to any other establishment, by way of employer's contributions plus interest thereon taken together with the amount, if any, payable under the Gratuity/Pension rules, be less than the amount that would be payable as employer's and employees' contribution together with interest thereon, if he were a member of the Provident Fund under the Employees' Provident Scheme, 1952, the employer shall pay the difference to the member as Compensation/Special Contribution.

7. Where employees are governed by the provisions of General Provident Fund Rules, 1960 or Contributory Provident Fund Rules, 1962 (India), no amendment of the rules of the Provident Fund which will result in reduction of existing benefits either directly and indirectly of such employees shall be made without consultation with the Department of Labour and Employment, Government of India.

8. No amendment of the rules of the provident fund shall be made without the previous approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner. Where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interests of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, shall, before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

[No. PF. II5 (5)/59]

दिनांक 21 नवम्बर, 1972

का० घ्रा० 4007. — यतः निर्माण, आवास मंत्रालय (मुख्य नियंत्रक, मुद्रण और लेखन-सामग्री, नई दिल्ली) के नियंत्रणाधीन विभाग द्वारा चलाए जाते वाले भारत सरकार के मुद्रणालयों (जिन्होंने इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) जो संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट हैं, ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन छूट देने के लिए आवेदन किया है।

और यतः उक्त मुद्रणालयों के कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि पेंशन या उपदान के रूप में प्रसुविधायें पा रहे हैं और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय में ऐसी प्रसुविधायें कुल मिलाकर उन प्रसुविधायों से कम अनुकूल नहीं है जो हम प्रकार के किसी अन्य स्थापन कारखाने के कर्मचारियों के सम्बन्ध में कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन दी जाती है।

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए और इससे उपावह अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त मुद्रणालयों को उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से एतद्वारा छूट देती है और उक्त धारा 17 की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निदेश देती है कि उक्त स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक उक्त स्थापन के उन कर्मचारियों को, जो यदि यह छूट न दी गई होती है, तो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन सबस्य हो गए होते, तत्समय देय वेतन के (आधारिक मजदूरी, महंगाई भत्ता, प्रातिपादन भत्ता यदि

कोई हो, और उस पर अनुज्ञेय खाद्य रियायत का लफ्फ मूल्य) 0.09 (शुल्क वसूलन शुल्क नौ प्रतिशत) प्रतिशत की दर से निरीक्षण-प्रभार भासास्त के पन्द्रह दिन के भीतर कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि को देगा।

अनुसूची I

विभाग द्वारा चलाए जाने वाले मुद्रणालयों के नाम :

1. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, मिन्टो रोड, नई दिल्ली।
2. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, राष्ट्रपति भवन, नई दिल्ली।
3. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, रिंग रोड, नई दिल्ली।
4. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, शिमला।
5. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, गैंगटोक, सिक्किम।
6. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, के० एस० राय रोड, कलकत्ता।
7. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, मन्दिर मार्ग, कलकत्ता।
8. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, सन्तरागाछी, हावड़ा।
9. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, अलीगढ़, यू० पी०।
10. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, निलोखेरी।
11. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, फरीदाबाद।
12. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, नासिक।
13. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, कोयम्बतूर।
14. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, कोराटी।

अनुसूची-II

1. नियोजक प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त को वे विवरणियां भेजेगा जिन्हें केन्द्रीय सरकार समय-समय पर विहित करे।
2. नियोजक प्रत्येक कर्मचारी को वार्षिक लेखा-विवरण या पास बुक देगा।
3. निधि के प्रशासन, जिसमें लेखाओं को बनाए रखना, लेखाओं और विवरणियों का भेजा जाना, संचयों का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण, प्रभारों आदि का संवाय सम्मिलित है, में अन्तर्विलित सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जायेगा।
4. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि (कानूनी निधि) या छूट-प्राप्त किसी अन्य स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही से सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित होता है तो नियोजक स्थापन को निधि के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त ही दर्ज करेगा और ऐसे कर्मचारी की बाबत उसके पिछले संचयों को स्वीकार करके उन्हें उसके खाते में जमा करेगा।
5. यदि उस वर्ग के स्थापनों के लिए, जिसमें नियोजक का स्थापन आता है, भविष्य निधि के अभिदायों की दर कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 के अधीन बढ़ा दी जाए तो नियोजक भविष्य निधि के अभिदायों की दर समुचित रूप से बढ़ा देगा ताकि स्थापन की भविष्य निधि स्कीम के अधीन की प्रसुविधायें उन प्रसुविधायों से कम अनुकूल न हो जाएं जिनकी व्यवस्था कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 के अधीन है।
6. स्थापन के भविष्य निधि नियमों में किसी बात के होते हुए भी यदि किसी सदस्य को उसके स्थापन का कर्मचारी न रहने पर संदेय या उसके किसी अन्य स्थापन में स्थानान्तरण पर स्थानान्तरण रकम जो नियोजक के अंशदान तथा उस पर उसका ब्याज के साथ, या किसी कोई रकम उपदत्त पेंशन नियमों के अधीन संदेय हो तो, उसे मिलाकर यदि वह रकम उस रकम में जो यदि वह कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 के अधीन सदस्य रहा होता तो नियोजक

के और कर्मचारी के अंशदान उस पर ब्याज सहित से, कम हो तो नियोजक सदस्य को प्रतिकर/विशेष अंशदान के रूप में दोनों का अन्तर देगा।

7. जब कर्मचारी साधारण भविष्य निधि नियम, 1960 या अंशदायी भविष्य निधि नियम, 1962 (भारत) के अन्तर्गत आते हों तो अम और रोजगार विभाग, भारत सरकार, से परामर्श किए बगैर भविष्य निधि के नियमों में कोई ऐसा संशोधन नहीं किया जाएगा जिससे प्रत्यक्षतः ऐसे कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त प्रसुविधायें कम हो जायें।
8. भविष्य निधि नियमों में कोई भी संशोधन प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जायेगा। जहाँ किसी संशोधन के कर्मचारियों के हितों पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ना संभाव्य हो वहाँ प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व, कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का मुक्तियुक्त अवसर देगा।

[सं० पी एफ II 5(5)/59]

S.O. 4008.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund Family Pension and Bonus Schemes Act, 1948 (46 of 1948), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No.S.O.2451 dated the 17th July, 1967, the Central Government hereby constitutes with effect from the 21-11-1972, a Board of Trustees consisting of the following persons, namely:—

1. Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, New Delhi. **Chairman**
2. The Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner, Dhanbad. **Ex-officio member**

MEMBERS

3. The Coal Controller, Council House Street, Calcutta. **Representatives of the Central Government.**
4. The Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner, Dhanbad. **Representatives of the State Governments.**
5. The Central Provident Fund Commissioner, New Delhi.
6. The Commissioner of Labour, Bihar Patna.
7. The Secretary, Labour Department Government of West Bengal, Calcutta-1.
8. The Commissioner of Labour, Madhya Pradesh, Indore.
9. The Commissioner of Labour, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.
10. The Deputy Commissioner of Labour, Government of Maharashtra, Liberty Cinema, Building, Sadar, Nagpur.
11. The Commissioner of Labour, Government of Orissa, Bhubaneswar.

12. Shri B.L. Wadehra, Director (Administration) National Coal Development Corporation, Darbhanga House, Ranchi.

13. Shri K.I. Vidyasagar, I.A.S., Managing Director, Singareni Collieries Co., Limited, Khairatabad-Post, Hyderabad-4(A.P.).

14. Shri R.C. Shekhar, Controller of Accounts, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office Sijua, Dhanbad.

15. Shri Pritamlal Chanchani, Sitalpur Coal Co. (P) Ltd., 18, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.

16. Shri Rasiklal Worah, M/s K. Worah & Co., (P) Ltd., 135, Biplabi Rashbehari Basu Road, Calcutta.

17. Shri G.R. Thukral, Bengal Coal Co. Ltd., P.O. Disergarh, Burdwan.

Representatives of employers.

18. Shri Gulab Gupta, General Secretary, M.P. Colliery Workers' Federation, 2015, Wright Town, Jabalpur (M.P.).

19. Shri B.Dubey, General Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Rajendra Path, Dhanbad (Bihar)

20. Shri S.Narayan Reddy, President, Andhra Pradesh Singareni Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, P.O. Kothagudem Collieries (Andhra Pradesh).

21. Shri Asish Maity, Secretary Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, G.T. Road, Asansol (West Bengal)

22. Shri Durga Bagchi, Working President, Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh, Office of the United Trade Union Congress, (Ranchi Branch), Monitola, P.O. Hinoo Rachi (Bihar).

23. Shri A.V. Brahma, Agent, Bastacolla Colliery, P.O. Dhansar, Distt. Dhanbad (Bihar).

Representatives of employees.

[I-11013(12)/71-PF-II]

का० प्रा० 4008.—कोयला खान भविष्य निधि, कुटुम्ब पेंशन और बोनस स्कीम अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 46) की धारा 3क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम और रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिवृत्त सं० का० प्रा० 2451, तारीख 17 जुलाई, 1967 को अधिग्रहण करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों बाधा न्यासी बोर्ड 21-11-1972 से गठित करती है, अर्थात् :—

1. उप-मंत्री,
श्रम और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय,
नई दिल्ली

अध्यक्ष

2. कोयला खान भविष्य निधि प्रायुक्त,
धनबाद

पदेन-सदस्य

सदस्य

3. कोयला नियंत्रक,
काउन्सिल हाउस स्टीट, कलकत्ता

4. कोयला खान कल्याण प्रायुक्त,
धनबाद

केन्द्रीय सरकार
के प्रतिनिधि

13 G. of I—7

5. केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि प्रायुक्त,
नई दिल्ली

6. श्रम प्रायुक्त, बिहार,
पटना

7. सचिव, श्रम विभाग,
पश्चिम बंगाल सरकार, कलकत्ता-1

8. श्रम प्रायुक्त,
मध्य प्रदेश, इन्दौर

राज्य सरकारों के
प्रतिनिधि

9. श्रम प्रायुक्त,
मान्य प्रदेश सरकार, हैदराबाद

10. श्रम उपायुक्त,
महाराष्ट्र सरकार, लिबर्टी सिनेमा, बिल्डिंग,
सदर, नागपुर

11. श्रम प्रायुक्त,
उड़ीसा सरकार, भुवनेश्वर

12. श्री बी० एल० बबेरा,
निदेशक (प्रशासन),
नेशनल कोल डेवलपमेंट कारपोरेशन,
दरभंगा हाउस, रांची

13. श्री के० आई० विद्यासागर, आई० ए० एम०,
प्रबन्ध निदेशक, सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क०, लिमिटेड,
खैराताबाद पोस्ट, हैदराबाद-4 (आ० प्र०)

14. श्री आर० सी० शेखर,
लेखा नियंत्रक,
भारत कोलिंग कोल लि०
पोस्ट आफिस—सिसुप्रा, धनबाद

नियोजकों के
प्रतिनिधि

15. श्री प्रीतमलाल चंघानी,
सीतसपुर कोल क० (प्रा०) लि०,
18, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-1

16. श्री रसिकलाल बोरा,
मेमर्स क० बोरा एण्ड क० (पी०) लि०,
135, बिपलाबी रासबिहारी बासु रोड, कलकत्ता

17. श्री जी० आर० ठुकराल,
बंगाल कोल क० लि०,
पो० आ० डिसेरगढ़, बर्दवान,

18. श्री गुलाब गुप्ता,
महामंत्री
एम० पी० कोलेरी वर्क्स फेडरेशन,
2015, रिट टाउन, जबलपुर (एम पी०)

19. श्री बी० बुबे महामंत्री,
कोलेरी मजदूर संघ,
राजेन्द्र पथ, धनबाद (बिहार)

20. श्री एस० नारायण रेड्डी, अध्यक्ष,
मान्य प्रदेश मिथनी कोलेरी मजदूर संघ,
पो० आ० कोथानुदैम, कोलेरी (मान्य प्रदेश)

कर्मचारि
प्रति

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
21. श्री असीस सेती, मंत्री, कालेरी मजदूर सभा, जी० टी० रोड, आसनसोल (पश्चिम बंगाल)	16. Kaira	Mahemdabad	M/s Mahemdabad Tiles & Marble Co.,	
22. श्री दुर्गा बागची, कार्यकारी, अध्यक्ष हिन्दुस्तान खान मजदूर संघ (रांची शाखा) मोनीतोला, पोस्ट आफिस हिल्स रांची बिहार	17. Do.	Piple	M/s Paper Cone & Bobbin Factory	
	18. Do.	Do.	M/s Unique Industries.	
	19. Do.	Vasad	M/s Navarang Tiles Co.,	
	20. Do.	Upleta	M/s Western India Industries	
23. श्री ए० वी० बहा, अधिकारी बस्ताकोला कोलेरी, पो० आ० धनसार, जि० धनबाद (बिहार)	21. Surendra-nagar	Muli	M/s Plastics Industries.	
	22. Panchmahal	Godhra	M/s Shree Gujrat Flour Mills.	
	23. Do.	Do.	M/s Vallabh Oil Mills.	
	24. Kaira	Petlad	M/s Narottamdas Jethabhai & Co.,	

[आई-11013(12)-71-पी एक-1]

The 22nd November, 1972

S.O. 4008.— In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) (No. S.O. 5311 dated 4th November, 1971, the Central Government having regard to the location of the factories specified in column (4) of the Schedule hereto annexed in area specified in column (3) of the said Schedule in the State of Gujarat in which the provisions of Chapter IV and V of the said Act are in force, hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year from the date of expiry of the period specified in the said notification or until the enforcement of provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in those areas, whichever is earlier.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Name of District	Name of area.	Name of the factory.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Ahmedabad	Bavla	M/s The Bavala Ram Vijay Cotton Ginning Factory
2.	Do.	Ambli Road	M/s Gujrat Iron & Steel Co., Ltd.
		Thaltej	
3.	Do.	Baraja	M/s S.T. Depot
4.	Do.	Sanand	M/s S.T. Benand
5.	Baroda	Samiala	M/s Apex Electricals.
6.	Bhavanagar	Mahuva	M/s Navarang Tiles.
7.	Jamnagar	Salaya	M/s Dwarkadas Vaji Salt Works.
8.	Do.	Okkha	M/s The Burmah Shell Installation.
9.	Do.	Do.	M/s Kathiwar Metal & Tin Works (P) Ltd.
10.	Do.	Do.	M/s Esso Standard Eastern Installation
11.	Do.	Do.	M/s Carborundum Universal Ltd.
12.	Do.	Do.	M/s Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.
13.	Do.	Do.	M/s Gujrat Electricity Board Power House.
14.	Do.	Kuottiyana	M/s Shree Hitesh Oil Mills & Ginning Factory.
15.	Do.	Do.	M/s Union Bearing Mfg. Co.

(Outside Municipal Limit)

(No. S-38017(78)/72-HD)

दिनांक 22 नवम्बर, 1972

का० आ० 4009.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73-ब द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 5311, तारीख 4 नवम्बर, 1971 के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा उपाखण्ड अनुसूची के स्तंभ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों की उक्त अनुसूची के स्तंभ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट गुजरात राज्य के ऐसे क्षेत्रों में, जिस में उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबंध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए, उक्त कारखानों को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्-ग्रहणीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से, उक्त अधिसूचना में विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि की समाप्ति की तारीख से एक वर्ष की और अवधि के लिए या तब तक के लिए जब तक कि उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबंध उन क्षेत्रों के प्रवृत्त नहीं हो जाते, जो पहले हों, एतद्द्वारा छूट देयी है।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	जिले का नाम	क्षेत्र का नाम	कारखाने का नाम
1	2	3	4
1.	अहमदाबाद	बावला	मैमसे बावलागम विजय काटन जिनिस फैक्ट्री।
2.	यथोक्त	अम्बली रोड थाल	मैमसे गुजरात आयरन एण्ड स्टील कं० लि०।
3.	यथोक्त	बरजा	मैमसे एम० टी० डिपो
4.	यथोक्त	सानन्द	मैमसे सानन्द
5.	बरौदा	नभीआला	मैमसे एपेक्स इलेक्ट्रीकल्स
6.	भावनगर	महुवा	मैमसे नवरंग टाइल्स
7.	जामनगर	सालया	मैमसे द्वारका दाम वाजी साल्ट वर्क्स।
8.	जामनगर	ओरखा	मैमसे दि०धर्मा शेल इन्स्टालेशन
9.	यथोक्त	यथोक्त	मैमसे काटियावाड़ मेटल एण्ड टीन वर्क्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड।

1	2	3	4
10. यथोक्त	यथोक्त	मैसर्स एसो स्टैण्डर्ड कास्टन इन-स्ट्रक्चर	
11. यथोक्त	यथोक्त	मैसर्स कार्वोरन्डस यूनिवर्सल लिमिटेड	
12. यथोक्त	यथोक्त	मैसर्स इंडियन आयाल कार्पोरेशन लि.	
13. यथोक्त	यथोक्त	मैसर्स गुजरात इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड पावर हाउस	
14. यथोक्त	कोट्टीयाना	मैसर्स श्री द्विपे आयाल सिल्स एण्ड जिनिंग फैक्ट्री	
15. यथोक्त	यथोक्त	मैसर्स यूनिवर्सल बेयरिंग मैक्यूकेन्स-रिंग कम्पनी	
16. कैरा	महेसदाबाद	मैसर्स महेसदाबाद टाइल्स एण्ड सारबल कं०	
17. यथोक्त	पीपल	मैसर्स पेपर कान एण्ड बोर्डिंग फैक्ट्री	
18. यथोक्त	यथोक्त	मैसर्स यूनिफाइड इण्डस्ट्रीज	
19. यथोक्त	ब्रमाळ	मैसर्स नवरंग टाइल्स कं०	
20. यथोक्त	उपलटा	मैसर्स वेस्टर्न इण्डिया इण्डस्ट्रीज	
21. सुरेन्द्रनगर	मूनी	मैसर्स प्लास्टीसाइड इण्डस्ट्रीज	
22. पंचमहल	गोधरा	मैसर्स श्री गुजरात क्लोर मिक्स	
23. यथोक्त	यथोक्त	मैसर्स बल्लभ आयाल सिल्स	
24. कैरा	पेटलाड	मैसर्स नरोत्तमदाम जंटा भाई एण्ड कं०	

(नगर पालिका सीमा के बाहर)

[सं० 38017(78)/72-एच I]

S.O. 4010.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73 F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 5318, dated the 12th November, 1971 the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factories specified in column (4) of the Schedule hereto annexed in areas specified in column (3) of the said Schedule in the State of Gujarat in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are not in force, hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year from the date of expiry of the period specified in the said notification or until the enforcement of provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in those areas, whichever is earlier.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Name of District	Name of area	Name of the factory
1.	Baroda	Dabhoi	M/s S.T. Depot
2.	Do.	Chhota-Udepur	M/s S.T. Depot
3.	Do.	Karajan	S.T. Depot
4.	Broach	Ankleshwar	M/s Precon (P) Ltd.
5.	Bulsar	Vaghldhara	M/s Kashyap Chemical Industries.
6.	Kaira	Vasas	M/s Asian Hydraulic Lime Works.
7.	Surat	Bardoli	M/s Sardar Cement Products.

(No. S-38017(78)/72 HI)

का० प्रा० 4010.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73F द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वासि मन्त्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 5318, तारीख 12 नवम्बर, 1971 के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार, इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों की उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट गुजरात राज्य के ऐसे क्षेत्रों में, जिनमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबंध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए, उक्त कारखानों को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्घाटनीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से, उक्त अधिसूचना में विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि की समाप्ति की तारीख से एक वर्ष की और अवधि के लिए या तब तक के लिए जब तक कि उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबंध में उन क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त नहीं हो जाने, जो भी पहले हो, एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	ज़िले का नाम	क्षेत्र का नाम	कारखाने का नाम
1	2	3	4
1.	बड़ोदा	डाभाई	मैसर्स एस० टी० डिपो
2.	यथोक्त	छोटा उदयपुर	एस० टी० डिपो
3.	यथोक्त	करजन	एस० टी० डिपो
4.	भड़ोच	अंकलेश्वर	मैसर्स प्रिकान (प्रा०) लि०
5.	बलसर	बोधलधारा	मैसर्स कश्यप केमिकल इण्डस्ट्रीज
6.	कैरा	वासम	मैसर्स एशियन हाइड्रॉलिक लाइम वर्क्स।
7.	सुरत	बारदोली	मैसर्स सरदार सीमेंट प्रोडक्ट्स

[सं० एस-380/7(78)/72-एच I]

The 24th November, 1972

S.O. 4011.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Reliance Fabrications (Private) Limited, 9-15, Swinhoe Lane, Calcutta-42 including its branch, at 54, Ezra Street, Calcutta-1 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirtieth day of June, 1971.

[No. S. 35017(48)/72-PF II]

दिनांक 24 नवम्बर, 1972

का. आ. 4011.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रिलायन्स फैब्रिकेशन्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 9-15 स्विनहो लेन, कलकत्ता-42 जिसमें इसकी शाखा 54-एजरा स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1 भी सम्मिलित है नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को एतद्वारा लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1971 के जून के तीसवें दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35017(48)/72-पी. एफ. 2]

S.O. 4012.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Architects Collaborated 2, Church Lane, Calcutta-1 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

NOW THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of January, 1972.

[No. S. 35017(51)/72-PF.II.]

का. आ. 4012.—यतः केंद्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मॅसर्स आर्किटेक्ट्स कोलाबोरेटेड, 2-चर्च लैन, कलकत्ता-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को एतद्वारा लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1972 की जनवरी के इकतीसवें दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35017(51)/72-पी. एफ. 2]

S.O. 4013.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Pla Components 1st Floor, Thakor Industries, Kurla Kiroi Road, Vidya Vihar, Bombay-86 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

NOW THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of March, 1972.

[No. S. 35018(69)/72-PF. II.]

का. आ. 4013.—यतः केंद्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मॅसर्स प्ला कम्पोनेन्ट्स, फर्स्ट फ्लोर, ठाकरे इंडस्ट्रीज, कुर्ला किरौल रोड, विद्या विहार, बम्बई-86 नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक

और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को एतद्वारा लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1972 के मार्च के 31वें दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35018(69)/72-पी. एफ. 2]

S.O. 4014.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Industrial Rubber Works, Clipwala Compound, 54 Sakivihar Road, Powai, Bombay including its Head office at 2nd floor Agakhan Building Dalal Street, Fort Bombay-1 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Fund and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirtieth day of September, 1972.

[No. S. 35018(70)/72-PF.II.]

का. आ. 4014.—यतः केंद्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मॅसर्स इण्डस्ट्रियल रबर वर्क्स, क्लिपवाला कम्पाउंड, 54 साकी बिहारोड, पावाई, मुम्बई, जिसमें आगाखान बिल्डिंग, दलाल स्ट्रीट फोर्ट मुम्बई-1 की द्वितीय मंजिल में इसका मुख्य कार्यालय भी सम्मिलित है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को एतद्वारा लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1971 के सितम्बर के तीसवें दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35018(70)/72-पी. एफ. 2]

S.O. 4015.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Murarka yarn and Fabrics Development, Bharat Mahal, 86, Marine Drive Block No. 8, Bombay-2 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of May, 1971.

[No.S.35018(77)/72-PF.II.]

का. आ. 4015.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मॅसर्स मुरारका यार्न एण्ड फॅब्रिक्स डवलपमेंट, भारत महल 86 मेरिन-डाइव ब्लॉक नं 8 बम्बई-2 नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को एतद्वारा लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1971 की मई के इकतीसवें दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35018(77)/72-पी. एफ. 2]

S.O. 4016.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sun Agencies, 279, Pycrafts Road, Madras-14, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notifications shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1972.

[No.S.35019(97)/72-PF.II(i).]

का. आ. 4016.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सन एजेंसीज, 279, पाइक्राफ्ट्स रोड, मद्रास-14 नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को एतद्वारा लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1972 के अप्रैल के प्रथम दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35019(97)/72-पी. एफ. 2 (1)]

S.O. 4017.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into

the matter, thereby specifies with effect from the 1st April, 1972, the establishment known as Messrs Sun Agencies, 279, Pycrafts Road, Madras-14, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019(97)/72-PF.II(ii)]

का. आ. 4017.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इस विषय में आवश्यक जाँच कर लेने के पश्चात् एतद्वारा मॅसर्स सन एजेंसीज 279, पाइक्राफ्ट्स रोड, मद्रास-14 नामक स्थापन को 1 अप्रैल, 1972 से उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं. एस. 35019(97)/72-पी. एफ. 2(2)]

S.O. 4018.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Parekh Agencies 287/290, Pycrafts Road, Madras-14 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Fund and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1972.

[No.S.35019/99/72-PF.II(i).]

का. आ. 4018.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मॅसर्स पारेख एजेंसीज, 287/290, पाइक्राफ्ट्स रोड, मद्रास-14 नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को एतद्वारा लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1972 के अप्रैल के प्रथम दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35019(99)/72-पी. एफ. 2(1)]

S.O. 4019.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter hereby specifies with effect from the 1st April, 1972, the establishment known as Messrs Parekh Agencies, 287/290, Pycrafts Road, Madras-14, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No.S.35019(99)/72-PF.II(ii).]

का. आ. 4019.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इस विषय

में आवश्यक जांच कर लेने के पश्चात् एतद्द्वारा, मैसर्स एजेंसीज, 287/290, पाइक्राफ्ट्स रोड, मद्रास-14 नामक स्थापन को 1 अप्रैल, 1972 से उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं. एस. 35019(99)/72-पी. एफ. 2 (2)]

S.O. 4020.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Hotel Swagath Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad-1 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Fund and Family Pension Fund Act 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of July, 1972.

[No.S.35019(119)/72-PF.II.]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

का.आ. 4020.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स होटल स्वागत नामपल्ली स्टेशन रोड, हैदराबाद-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्धित नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को एतद्द्वारा लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1972 की जुलाई के प्रथम दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35019(119)/72-पी. एफ. 2]

दलजीत सिंह, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 28th October, 1972

S.O. 4021.—In pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 14 sub-section (1) of section 15, Sections 16, 17 and 18 of the Personal Injuries (Compensation Insurance) Act, 1963 (37 of 1963), the Central Government hereby authorises the Chief Inspector of Factories and the Deputy Chief Inspector of Factories, Maharashtra to exercise the powers under sections 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the said Act throughout the State of Maharashtra and the Inspectors of Factories, Maharashtra to exercise the powers under sections 14 and 15 of the said Act, within their respective jurisdiction.

[No. S. 19025/27/72-Fac.]

V. K. CHANANA, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 28 अक्टूबर, 1972

का. आ. 4021.—वैयक्तिक क्षति (प्रतिकार बीमा) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 37) की धारा 14 की उपधारा (1), धारा 15 की उपधारा (1), धारा 16, धारा 17 और धारा 18 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, सर्वत्र महाराष्ट्र राज्य में महाराष्ट्र के कारखानों के मुख्य निरीक्षक और उपमुख्य निरीक्षक को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 14, 15, 16, 17 और 18 के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए और महाराष्ट्र के कारखानों के निरीक्षकों को क्रमशः अपनी अधिकारिता में, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 14 और 15 के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए, एतद्द्वारा प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. एस-19025/27/72-कारखाने]

वी. के. चानना, उप सचिव